

# FAITH AND FREEDOM



A JOURNAL OF  
PROGRESSIVE RELIGION

LIBRARY  
STARR KING SCHOOL  
NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM BUILDING

Volume 13  
Part 3

SUMMER  
1960

Number  
39

# FAITH AND FREEDOM

*A JOURNAL OF PROGRESSIVE RELIGION*

*Editor:* E. SHIRVELL PRICE, M.A.

*Assistant Editor:* A. K. ROSS, B.C.L., M.A.

*Associate Editor:* CHARLES W. PHILLIPS, A.M., B.D.

---

VOL. 13, PART 3

SUMMER 1960

NUMBER 39

---

## THE CHOIR INVISIBLE

DAVID L. WATSON .. .. . 97

## CONVERSION NOT PERVERSION

ERIC LINCOLN .. .. . 105

## RELIGION IN EDUCATION

F. LINCOLN RALPHS .. .. . 106

## BIBLE MIRACLES AND THE GODHEAD OF JESUS

FRANK R. HANCOCK .. .. . 111

## NEW LOOK AT PHILO JUDAEUS

ESME WYNNE-TYSON .. .. . 115

## THE CREATIVE WRITER IN A TECHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

TOM WARDLE .. .. . 120

## JUNG AND HUMAN EVIL

RONALD M. MAZUR .. .. . 127

## EDITORIAL POSTSCRIPT AND LETTER

.. .. . 143

---



*LAUNCHED AT THE INSTANCE OF THE OLD  
STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION OF MANCHESTER  
COLLEGE, OXFORD, WITH THE FINANCIAL  
SUPPORT OF THE DR. DANIEL JONES TRUST  
PUBLISHED AT  
MANCHESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD, ENGLAND*

---

Editorial and Subscriptions at 13 Shrewsbury Road, Bolton, Lancs.

*Sterling Area Annual Subscription 7/6. Single Copies 2/6,  
by post 2/10. Remit to Editor at above address.*

*Dollar Area Annual Subscription \$1.50 Single Copies 50c*

*U.S.A. Remit to R. RAIBLE, 4015, Normandy, Dallas,  
5, Texas, U.S.A.*



## *The Choir Invisible*

DAVID L. WATSON

THE aspect of the world crisis on which we can all agree is that men and women are suffering—suffering as perhaps never before. At the heart of all the baffling complexities is the sore need of mankind: of our kin, our friends, our neighbours, of countless unhappy souls throughout the world—yes, of ourself.

The sum of pain, grief, uncertainty, fear, lust, hatred, anxiety and despair, of unsolved and seemingly insoluble problems in the minds and hearts of our fellows everywhere beggars the imagination. The race of man is on the spot. . . . and they need our help.

To each of us is given some light as to what he or she can do: cultivate a more ready kindliness, work and fight for healthier, saner community, for better-focussed education, for less dehumanizing and better-paid labour, for more responsible government and sounder political policies . . . for the exposing of injustice and cruelty wherever we find it, for deeper truth and wider freedom.

*Yes. But the tasks are so great, our strength so limited . . . our science so imperfect, our wisdom so fleeting, our kindness so quickly frayed and thwarted, our courage and faith so soon exhausted.*

For these tasks are beyond the grasp of any one brain in their scope and intricacy. The machine is getting out of control. The forebodings of Wells and Russell have turned out to be right: it is a race between civilization and disaster. And what dismays us is the seemingly hopeless dearth of time, energy, poise, and insight that each of us can summon up for our sector of the job.

In such extremity, men in the past have always, in the end, found guidance and strength. That renewal of faith has seemed to come from an unseen Source. Yet it has spurred men to weave together whatever in their way of life eased the pain, or gave hope. Such effort is one aspect of religion: the steady search to organize the assets and possibilities, to surmount the afflictions, to rise above self-love, to cherish the vision of a happier future. Religion has taken root and endured everywhere to the extent that, no matter how, it met the urgent need, soothed the unbearable ache, or fed the famished soul.

But when we today turn to the churches, though they may give help to some, they are soon found wanting. This one asks us to believe in unscientific marvels and magic ritual; that one is too largely a snobbish tool of worldly ambition. One is an ugly taskmaster of unreasonable "do's" and envious "don'ts"; another is mostly an agenda of social-political activity. . . . Most are undemo-

cratic in organization (though they may not realize it) or lack the scientific temper in their search for truth. As to their creeds, much of what survived the earlier onslaughts of astronomy, geology, and darwinism has been pulverized by the more recent findings of anthropology, psychiatry, medicine, history and comparative religion.

Those churches that are ready to reopen the deeper, central issues too often lack aesthetic sense, emotional depth, or social wisdom.

Each embodies some great good. All fall far short of what the hour requires. Nowhere yet is there a style, a medium, an adequate vessel for the rich and tragic fulness of human living.

Seeing all this, secularists turn away from what seem to them to be ancient delusions and time-consuming side-issues to a reliance on empirical science, democratic activism, and "the good life". They are content "to do justly, and love mercy" (*Micah* 6, 8). This is excellent as far as it goes. But for the mass of men and women a devotion to good works needs something to sustain it. As *Micah's* message went on to say, perhaps they must also "walk humbly with their God".

Modern man finds chaos and the progressive dehumanizing of life gaining on him. The vast crisis spawns new dilemmas, deeper discouragements, bleaker fears faster than we can handle those we already have. Biologically, we are a species whose setting is changing too speedily for our habits of adaptation. From every corner of the earth comes the cry: Where do we go from here?

As never before, the race of Man needs something to put guts, faith, and vision into him—something that will subdue his self-made technological purgatory, something to reconcile and harmonize his many competing ideas, customs, aims and peoples.

And there are now many who, with the Church, begin to feel that "something" is God. It is barely possible they are right. It was from this Source that our forebears drew the faith and courage to outlast and outgrow defeat. Certainly we must give this hypothesis a fair and full try: that mysterious communion with our inner life and the cosmic order, visible and invisible, which may teach us again to tap the reservoirs of spiritual power, to know and choose the good and the true, to find our hard place in the battle, when mechanism, good fellowship or the main chance urge us to cling to the easy, the prudent, or the expedient.

If so, our encyclopaedia of problems—as the prophets and the saints have taught—becomes a single problem.

It is not possible to write this appeal without running into these basic cleavages of belief which divide us. What is most needed in this regard is a democratic tolerance—a humility that is ready to allow that the other fellow may also be right. *What* he or his friends say is less to the point than *why* they say it. For, all beliefs, customs and institutions are imperfect expressions of deeper, more enduring, though largely inexpressible needs.



When, for instance, we talk of "the Lord", the sceptical humanist must put on the brakes and strive to discern what aspects of this ancient idiom are still valid for him. He must learn to translate the idea into his own way of thinking as "Destiny", "the Ultimate Essence", "the Form of all Forms", or the other metaphors of, say, Aristotle and Spinoza. . . . The believer, meanwhile, must be able to stomach the thought that his personal God has chosen to reveal to such sceptics no more than that He is a reassuring—yet often misleading and arbitrary—poetic device.

"The Lord" then, the hidden intrinsic Tendency of the Cosmos, seems in retrospect to favour certain developments. Some will call this "the probable trend", others "the will of God". Of what this is, today, both factions know little. Yet every turn of events, every sincere act teaches us something. It has been clear for some time that most of the proposed blueprints of the future (sacred or secular) are not now to be relied upon. And when these are found wanting, the paradox is that the trivial or irksome duty that lies to our hand or heart will actually give more hope. To practise love when it hurts is harder, yet more fruitful, than to explain why such is a desirable policy.

We have overestimated the scope of rational foresight. In his inability to control his destiny, man is closer to his animal cousins than he has believed. The thoughtful student of nature will admit that he cannot hope to advise his wild friends of the woods as to how to improve their mode of life. Scientific analysis could not devise for a robin, a grasshopper or a deer a better life-policy than they have worked out for themselves throughout their immense history. Simply by solving piecemeal the problem of today as it arises, such creatures have achieved the incredible and unforeseen adaptation and harmony of their life-schedules. And for the race of man too, much that is wisest in his cultures has been forged step by step, by trial and error, without his being aware where each step was leading him. *Yet man is most human when he discerns where he is going.*

Most of us today are in the role of Martha: "full of care and troubled about many things." (*Luke 10, 41.*) Yet Mary too, was right in choosing "that good part", in sitting at the feet of the Light, and seeking better to learn what love taught. . . .

It was Martha's nature to 'get on with the job'. Mary sought rather to learn and to love the truth. The sons of Martha today, as always, are impatient with those who leave the job in hand in order to respond to what they regard as a higher duty. While the sons of Mary too seldom come down out of the clouds and get to know what men most need.

Yet each needs the other. The pietist, theorist and mystic need the discipline of practical commonsense. The energy of the practical man needs more patience and insight. For, *above all, we as yet lack the right ideas:* the ways of thought and feeling adequate to our

desperate need. . . . Certainly many worthy persons are making a contribution—patiently unsnarling the disorder in their own backyard. And true, the larger answers will slowly grow from the mutual fertilization of many such efforts. Yet, these countless part-offerings urgently call for the ideas that will tie them together. Motion is not enough: harmony we must also have. “This is my commandment,” said Jesus, “that ye love one another.”

We cannot love until we understand. And the road to that understanding, that brotherhood of men the world over, that yearned-for harmony is certainly, in part, the road of sober thought and sceptical science: the persistent striving to find the meaning of what we are about. Thus the numberless part-tasks need and imply a further, more comprehensive task. We need light to see better what we are doing, some sense of where our path is taking us, some vision of the whole—a vision that may illuminate, and thus focus, each part-effort, part-insight, part-devotion, and, in the end, reshape them to greater awareness and fruitfulness.

*We need a theology for the modern man.*

For most of our generation, the great road-block on the road to faith, hope and love is the *idea* of God—especially the idea of God as a *person* who may speak to us and to whom we may pray. The modern mind can usually tolerate an impersonal, abstract idea of God such as Aristotle or Einstein derived from their scrutiny of the natural world, an Essence of all things, a Master Tendency of every event, the Totality of all that is, a Whole that gives meaning to the parts, a Fountain of Life and a Dynamic of growth and evolution, a Unitary texture of natural Law that governs the cosmos.

It is when we begin to think and talk of God as a personal influence and friend that the modern mind balks.

This metaphysical trend, this spiritual impersonality has grown steadily alongside the scepticism and constructive drive of science and machine industry partly as cause, partly as effect. For two centuries we, in the West, have busied ourselves mostly with lifeless things and processes, with the grasp and use of the sub-human. Is it surprising that our God too has become subhuman, that we have lost the art of discerning, in nature and history, a Fabric of meaning, a sensitiveness of Response, an outgoing Tenderness, a personal flavour such as we find daily in ourselves and in others? “*And Jesus, when he came out, saw much people, and was moved with compassion toward them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things.*” (Mark, 6, 34.)

The person of Jesus is of central importance, not least because he, above all, aids us to discern this personal quality in the scheme of things. Because he cared so passionately about the misery of men, and taught so unforgettably the way of love, he has become, for the western imagination, the personal symbol of the power of Love. Our biological science now belatedly discerns what was clear to Darwin: that for humankind, co-operation is more decisive for



survival and fruitfulness than competition. Jesus taught the doctrine in its most extreme form: "love your enemies, do good to them that hate you" . . . "But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil."

As Jesus saw, the mass of men are "as sheep not having a shepherd". They need, and need desperately, all possible aid, *personal* aid, in keeping their attention focussed on what really matters. Above all others, Jesus persuades us to search our hearts and minds, and to join forces with those who care enough about that search. These are the strategic needs, "the things of God". Whatever endangers these strikes at the heart of all hope, of all reconstructive effort. And both of these are today threatened and thwarted from a thousand directions, not least by overpreoccupation with tactical or secondary issues, however urgent: "the things of this world".

It is not enough to give our strength, our days and nights, to the doom-threat of World War III, to resisting the militarist-fascist trends it fosters, to the alleviation of racial tensions or other group-centred injustices, to the quest for personal and civic sanity, or to the nurturing of those secular assets which promise aid. We shall not defend the Good and the True against the onslaught of the New Barbarism (whether of international Communism, or of its home-grown rivals and allies) unless we put first things first.

To put first things first—*all* the time—is the essence of the religious instinct. All special-purpose, limited-liability, "get-on-with-the-job" outfits are, though they do not yet know it, groping towards God. Daily their conscience is whispering that "patriotism is not enough"—no, nor science, nor democracy, nor even a love which stops at the creature, and does not go on to find the Creator—the Universal Love which makes the creature lovable.

It is this very error that is a major source of our plight—the faith in something *less* than the All-good, the All-true, the All-lovely. It is the worship of false gods that endangers the race of man. The overmastering need, then, becomes to find again the *true* God—that engine for our aspiration that evokes our compassion, feeds our faith, and lights our path. We must therefore learn again to cultivate all that fortifies and guides the religious yearning in all of its many forms:

—A personal, community and political idiom that evokes the selfless and "higher" functions,

—Better and kinder means of opening to all the inexhaustible teachings and loveliness of Nature, which so firmly rebuke our over-concern with the works of man and nourish serenity of the spirit,

—For those who crave its supreme blessings: solitude, long and silent contemplation, "waiting on the Lord"—yes, prayer,

—The healing and unifying influence of collective worship, and therefore, all that makes it possible and valid:

—The ecclesiastical arts: church music, scripture, liturgies, homiletics, psychotherapy—which, while using what is good in the past, express faithfully and transmute the hungers of today,

—And, not least, a structure of ideas and feelings, a metaphysics, or better still, a poetry which can purify, orient and order all such foods for the soul.

Scrap the word "theology", if you will. The need is there. Tradition has confined the scope of the term largely to the last of these headings, and even there, within formal limits we can no longer accept.

The theology we need, and which can be again the living heart of all our striving, must include all of these aspects, and much more. It must and will be as broad and as deep as all the peoples, all the cultures, all the histories, all the arts, all the sciences, all the saints, all the fertile soil of man's bliss and anguish. . . . The core of the matter is not the *words* we use in addressing the inscrutable Unseen, or in explaining the shape of our faith and fellowship. The nature of our God is disclosed, above all, in the quality and direction of the life and love He inspires.

If we in the West fail to develop a mysticism rooted in the best of modern science and culture (liberal-Christian, democratic, able to grow) then men will continue to adhere to the pseudo-mysticisms and pseudo-theologies of nationalism, worldly "success", pan-sexualism or woman-worship, "planning", "organization", fascist power-lust and Marxian Communist nihilism. Man is incurably the god-maker, and must reverence something beyond himself.

Secular intellectualism, or liberal rationalism unaided, do not provide the approach we need, because they do not come enough to terms with the irrational nature of the Unconscious. The protestant churches, like the universities and all well-meaning political activism overvalue the intellectual-analytical component in man, and thus grossly misconceive his true nature. And this plays into the hands of the supernaturalists, the obscurantists, the totalitarians, and the new barbarians.

We are not joining those who would turn their backs on Reason. We are seeking the wiser Reason, the Wisdom that never loses sight of the fact that man, of necessity, much of the time, is unreasonable. Our conceptualizing brain is a late acquisition. During immense epochs our subhuman forebears did not, could not, think or talk. The core of their being, *and ours*, was action and feeling. The heart needs a song more than the head a plan, because it is so much older, so much wiser.

The church, at its best, has striven to appeal in a balanced way to the whole man, via the whole community. This is a complex and subtle task. True, the archaic science of traditional religion must go. But much that the church has nourished is of the essence of our need: the use (as we have said) of *all* the arts to foster spiritual dedication, the learning of skill and persistence in prayer and mystical contemplation, a steady concern with the good or evil that flow from our thoughts and works, the readiness to pay the high price of a sincere love of neighbour, and the cultivation of the theological



imagination which can, as it travels these routes, slowly grope its way to the discovery of a nucleus and energiser of the Whole. It is not chiefly an intellectual or political synthesis that we need—but rather a humility, a sense of unworthiness, of having fallen far short of our best, that opens the soul to other men's needs, to a oneness with the ecological-cosmic symphony, to the blissful sentiment, God is Love.

What part will the Christian tradition play in such a cultural rebirth? Does it hark back too much to "the words uttered long ago by ignorant men," as Bertrand Russell feels? Certainly, much of institutional Christianity has rested on magic, has been allied with political privilege and repression, has worshipped words and symbols instead of facts, has flattered men's weakness for exclusiveness and intolerance and is wedded to an inflexible ethics (out of keeping with our age) and to unscientific approaches to the nature of reality. The churches, with few exceptions, as we have said, are cluttered with the discredited errors of the past, and the ignoble fears of the present.

Yet, in the eyes of a charitable anthropological relativism, the search for God is seen to have taught men much that we need today. We must learn to take the monotheistic world-view, in the first place, as *poetry*, potentially the supreme poetry—the means of nourishing that sense of the whole, which alone can aid us to know truly the parts. Guided by our wider and more sceptical vision of the nature of truth, theology, in concert with the arts, philosophy and science, could become again the supreme art-form through which man's relation to his fellow man and to the symphony of Nature, could again nourish his being and ease his anguish.

"God" is, let us say, what the whole of experience adds up to, both as orchestration of grasp, and as intimate personal persuasion. When we measure religion by what it could be, the scriptures, the hymns, the labours of love, the fight for self-rule, the aspiring communities, the prophets, the saints, and the living Christ are seen at once to have made priceless gains for our need today. The psalms, Jeremiah's assertion of the authority of individual spiritual vision (31, 31), second Isaiah's poetic intuition of the role of the suffering servant in cultural leadership (something deeper, by far, than the classical Prometheus myth), and the seminal teachings and acts by which Jesus used such decisive insights to give the warp of Western history a pattern that still lives on in countless hearts—all this, and much more, is utterly relevant to our extremity.

Culture is a living thing. It never starts afresh. Like an evolving animal, it uses for the most part the structures it already has, to meet the demand for revolutionary change. And just as one branch of the mammals took to the sea again, to become the whales, so Jesus (like the greatest of the prophets) found, in the formal and sometimes cruel and jingoistic cult of Judaism, the germs of something quite different: the poetry of spiritual-metaphysical experiment and spontaneity ("the wind bloweth where it listeth") and the piety of universal brotherhood.

For us, today, the essence of the impetus of Christ is that we still find in him the heroic faith that liberates the frozen assets and convinces us (against reason) that all things are possible along the straight and narrow path of love. Christ, as Van Gogh the ex-preacher saw, was "an artist greater than any other. . . . He created neither statues, pictures nor even books . . ." For his work was to give the *soul* of man a new form and tendency, and to reshape the tides of history. Christ lives today because the seed of his being has taken root in our moral-aesthetic being. As Wallace Tavener says, Christianity has become "a tough factor in history" because its vital kernel is "the sublimest poetry".

The world-culture now struggling to be born, based on the scientific temper, responsible government, the free mind, and the open, unfinished cosmos, will incorporate all such gains of the past that can be forged on its anvil.

And especially the culture of the heart, which today is sick and confused, will then find much of what it most needs in our Christian heritage and dynamic. The music of Bach, the Lucan gospel, the Service Committees of Friends and Unitarians and all they mean, and the allegiance which all great men have given to the strangely vital memory of Jesus (who sought "not his own will, but the will of Him that sent him") are fields of spiritual force which must and do move us, as they have moved our forebears. It is this Candle which we must take from under the bushel of dogma and technique and set on the candlestick of the good neighbour, "that it may give light to all that are in the house."

We raise the candle. Not as self-contained and pitifully frail individual persons, not primarily as members of this or that faction, society, or church, but as agents, largely passive agents, however weak, of the same deathless Tendency. The heroic and holy company of the Choir Invisible come again to stand at our elbows, when we rediscover the secret of their humility and dedication. That secret, Christ's secret, is the meekness and utter faith in God's merciful providence which precede the influx of grace. "For by grace are ye saved through faith . . . Not of works, lest any man should boast, For we are His workmanship . . ." (*Ephesians* 2, 8-9.)

The task remains. The call must be answered. On the one hand, wherever we turn throughout the world we see our fellows in desperate need. As the Oxford (1952) world conference of the Society of Friends put it: "suffering, starving, homeless, at war, unloved, underprivileged, afraid, cut off from the knowledge of God's love, or indifferent to it."

On the other hand, there is the Church, with all of its many sins and failures, its blindness, yes. Yet nursing at its heart a noble, indefatigable, holy yearning to answer that very need, to slake this world-wide thirst:

"To heal the broken hearted,  
To loose the bands of wickedness,



To undo the heavy burdens,  
 And to let the oppressed go free.  
 To preach deliverance to the captives,  
 And recovering of sight to the blind,  
 To comfort all that mourn:  
 To give unto them beauty for ashes,  
 And the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness."  
 (Luke 4, 18 and Isaiah 42, 7; 58, 6 and 61, 1-3)

These words were first written more than 2,000 years ago. We know them today because Jesus repeated some of them (Luke 4, 18), and because his spirit has lived on in those who cherished, translated, and broadcast the poetry that has become our Bible. And in that ever-living tradition surely lies for us a signpost to the road we must travel. The true Church has ever sought to succour the afflicted. What else is the Church than the one-ness, the habit, the skill, the persistent dedication of those who seek to know what comes first, to find, like Mary, the Light, and to follow it?

"Prepare the way,  
 Take up the stumbling block out of the way of my people."  
 (Isaiah 57, 14)

That stumbling block is the same as when these words were written: we, most of us, have lost the art of thinking, feeling and doing by which God becomes for us a real and compelling experience. We have first to learn to discern, for our day, the overmastering loveliness, the love that frees and unites, the inscrutable Power that "fainteth not neither is weary" and that, if we will but wait on Him, will strengthen our hearts.

**David L. Watson** is a B.Sc. and Ph.D. of Edinburgh in physical chemistry and was also a Rockefeller Fellow at Columbia. He was in charge of the maintenance and repair of most of the Chemical industry in the U.S. during the war, as a member of the War Production Board. He has taught chemistry at New York University and physics at Antioch. He now lives on the West Coast of Scotland. He has written widely in scientific journals, has published *Scientists are Human* (Watts, London, 1938) and a critical appraisal of the social sciences: *The Study of Human Nature* (Antioch Press, 1954). Previous article in this Journal: 'The Will to Make Believe' No. 36.

### "CONVERSION NOT PERVERSION" (In reply to Enid Shears)

BUT God surrendered to His creature man,  
 The power to break the vessel He began  
 That in His time he might regret the breaking.  
 So by His will His creature He did save  
 From the unwanted status of a slave  
 That he His image might in part be taking.

# Religion in Education

F. LINCOLN RALPHS\*

"If thou love to hear thou shalt receive understanding; and if thou bow thine ear, thou shalt be wise." (*Ecclesiasticus* VI, v 33.)

TODAY education is news. Not many generations ago it was reserved for a few. Today a different view prevails. In spite of the strange uses of literacy we know that illiteracy is a menace. There is no security in a world divided between the Haves and the Have-nots, even in the matter of education.

The Church is often criticised for not marching with the times. In education it marches well ahead of the times. In days when education was for the privileged and the state had little interest in schools, the Church stepped in. Godly people set their hands to the task of providing general education. And not only education. God-fearing people gave their leadership to social reform. They pioneered the organisations which came to the rescue of the unfortunate. They spoke on behalf of those who could not speak for themselves as they still speak in this World Refugee Year. In these prosperous, but materialistic days we are apt to forget this witness. We overlook that early sacrifice which came from a sense of purpose and a deep religious conviction, the like of which is all too rare today. Today self-expression is the acceptable form of selfishness.

It is sometimes said, by way of criticism, that the aim of the Church in providing schools was little more than indoctrination. Children were taught to read so that they could read the Bible. I hold that to be no unworthy aim especially when you consider the alternatives now offered, and accepted, especially on Sundays. What are the people of England now, at this moment, reading that is better than the Bible? When the Church can reach beyond sectarian loyalties its interest in education is deep. Indeed it is fundamental. It springs from a vital concern for the well-being of man and a recognition of man's place in creation. It is pointless to talk of the purpose of education if we do not consider the purpose of life itself. This is an issue too often evaded by educationists. The Church need offer no apology for training men to read the Bible. This is a book which grapples with the real issues of life. To Crown and commoner alike it is the lively oracle of God. It comes to grips at once with man's place in Creation. Its essential truth should not be discarded because it is clothed in the idiom of its age. Nor is this truth conditioned by our willingness to believe. Its import is missed if we do not bring all our intelligence to bear upon it. In this, as in all else, the Christian is required to exercise his mind and not to indulge in the escapism of credulity or the irrationalism of prejudice.

\* Personal Note on p. 114.



The first chapters of *Genesis* do not contain twentieth-century scientific theory nor the thirtieth-century theory that will supersede it. The conflict which sprang from the apprehensions of churchmen and the arrogance of scientists obscured this issue sixty years ago. Today there is a more reasonable approach to the Scriptures. There is a growing recognition among thoughtful people that this old book has something of fundamental significance to say about the nature of man. It reveals an insight at once presentive and profound. It is not content to excuse that which it should seek to redeem. The Old Testament reveals an emerging mind uniquely able to anticipate Messiah. There is no cheap and tawdry conception of human nature. The fall is not denied neither is the conception in glory. Man was made in the image of his Creator. This image still justifies the patient research that goes to the cure of his disease, research based often unwittingly on the unwavering faith that man is to be made whole. We are challenged to break our bonds for conscience's sake, not to adapt ourselves to them for comfort's sake. We are too precious to be enslaved by tyranny or ignorance. We are challenged to subdue our environment. We may attain to understanding and to wisdom. It is the Father's will that we should inherit the earth, but His will is to be obeyed not flouted. Our freedom is in his service. Our science advances in obedience to his law not in opposition to it. We may not usurp his position or ignore his presence, whether we find it in the law of gravity or in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. He has not abandoned his universe. The voice of the Lord God is still to be heard walking in the garden in the cool of the day. If thou love to hear thou shalt receive understanding; and if thou bow thine ear, thou shalt be wise.

This is the view of man which the Church asks us to find in the Bible. It is strong and challenging. I believe that it is the main-spring of true education. It explains why the Church could hardly escape from a compelling interest in schools in days when education was regarded as a luxury. Now that schools are generally provided it has still the duty to call to our recollection the nature and purpose of Man's creation. It must for ever rebuke those who under-estimate our quality; who concede no greater motivation than the impulse of sex or the self interest of power. The church must continue to assert that human nature has divine origin. Men are more than acquisitive animals, they must aspire to their place a little lower than the angels. For this reason our blindness must be dealt with. Our eyes must be opened, not merely to find food but to observe beauty. The lilies of the field are for our consideration. Our ears must be unstopped so that we can hear the music of life and appraise its harmonies. God does not shout, we must love to hear if we are to receive understanding. Our lips must be unsealed so that we can pray and praise, and prayer requires more patience than this busy world is prone to give save in extremity.

This faith is no aimless animation, no idiot's tale but purposeful

intention. Upon the momentum of this faith we have progressed so far. Our emancipation could be imperilled by a humanism without roots. We harvest our parent's sowing. Posterity gathers the product of our seed. It is well to be reminded that it is God's world not ours. It is in *bowing* the ear that we are wise. This is not subjection but deliverance. The Bible claims that in this way man is raised by God from the dust of the earth to his place a little lower than the angels. This is the evolutionary path of God's intention. It is a joint call to work and worship. This is the true import of education now happily set down in the Education Act of 1944: 'The school day in every county school and in every voluntary school shall begin with collective worship'. And since it is no part of God's intention to compel, it is open to all to withdraw.

It is more than coincidence that education legislation tends to follow hard on the heels of war. Our need of each other is then more keenly felt. In 1944, in the midst of a world-wide conflict, the outcome of which was unknown, while struggling against the forces that strove to overwhelm us from without, we overcame the barriers that divided us from within, and produced a charter of education which was the best in the world. A charter, I repeat, which begins each school day with worship.

Unhappily we have not lived up to this charter as we have not lived up to God's intention in creation. Goaded by the compelling urgencies of science and technology we have been made aware of the value of scientists but are left indifferent to the value of saints. In spite of our charter it is still easier to secure permission to include a cloakroom than a chapel in our new school buildings.

Nonetheless progress has been made. Better school buildings, improved facilities are everywhere to be seen. (Education Sunday in 1960 could well take on the characteristics of a harvest festival.) The work to which the church first set its hand has now been taken up with enthusiasm by many but perhaps from a different motive. In the mid-twentieth century we might well re-examine the aims of education, lest in crying *floreat scientia* and chasing after knowledge we confuse education with knowledge and wisdom with erudition. We might be developing an ear that is arrogant not bowed, an education which does not ask what men are but only what they know.

There is still danger in that ancient tree of knowledge honoured though it was by a central position in the garden of Eden. Let us not despise knowledge. It is a tree with attractive fruit. Yet in the eating we could lose humility and appetite, wax vain, grow fat and fall again. To be satisfied with knowledge alone gives us both the power of the atom and the peril of being driven out from a twentieth-century Garden of Eden. The essential danger of modern education is its quantitative rather than its qualitative emphasis, size is confused with significance, power with purpose. In such context, knowledge could make us vain, shame and respect could be at a discount, morality could be shaken into wild fluidity having outgrown the



Gods of our fathers, we might be left to seek our way alone, to ask, as a teenage girl recently asked one of our head teachers, what is the point of being noble? This is not the only generation in which pride precedes a fall.

If we *loved* to hear we might receive understanding. If we *bowed* our ear, we might be wise. The lively oracle of God still speaks. The Bible calls us to remembrance. Hear the words of *Isaiah*: Thy knowledge it hath perverted thee,  
 Thou has said in thine heart,  
 I AM and none else beside me,  
 Therefore shall evil come upon thee.

Hear the words of Jeremiah:

Let not the mighty man glory in his might,  
 Let not the rich man glory in his riches,  
 But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth  
 and knoweth me,  
 That I am the Lord.

Hear the words of St. Paul:

Though I have the gift of prophesy, and understand all  
 mysteries and all knowledge,  
 Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains,  
 And have not charity, I am nothing.

Hear the words of Jesus:

What is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose  
 his own soul?

Perhaps some of you will feel that it is not easy these days to believe that we have much of a soul to lose or that against the background of our new affluence its loss would be significant. It has never been easy for a rich man to get into heaven. Possessions no less than power can corrupt.

The mystery of qualitative things almost inevitably tempts us to imagine that only in science is there a solid foundation of truth. But science is restricted to the revelation of such aspects of reality as are capable of one form of demonstration and one form only. The soul surrenders to no such technique of scale and measurement. The techniques of science are as inappropriate to its discernment as are size and weight in the appraisal of a picture. There is no fundamental conflict between the truths of science and the truths of religion. Scientists no less than saints tread the way of obedience and sacrifice. Their willingness to do this underlies their success. Impiety springs from the attempt to restrict God's providence to what eye hath seen and ear heard; to seek only a material explanation for all phenomena of life, to attempt to crystallise character in a test tube.

Here is a new challenge to education and to the Church. We have to nurture the souls of men in an age inclined to regard morality as a matter of glands and science as a new religion. Ours is a world too impatient to listen, too proud to bow its ear, too prone to be drawn into the vacuum of agnosticism. Man cannot be sustained for

ever on a diet of doubt. To new learning, as to old, the Christian is required to give neither unquestioning acceptance nor unreasoning rejection. He is commanded to use his whole mind to prove all things and to hold to that which is good, to offer new bottles for new wine but not to destroy the good crop in an over-eagerness to root out the obvious weed. We need not tremble if our dust is found to be full of power and our environment full of opportunity. It could hardly be otherwise if it is the Lord's creation. The way to the moon should properly excite our interest though we need to remember that it is but a small journey in the habitation of God. The vastness of space should not depress us. It has been said that the Creature who is able to observe cannot be less than the Creation that can only be observed.

Let us therefore not hesitate to venture in faith. Man finds about him eternal order, and order is only associated with mind. God is revealed rather than obscured by our new discoveries. If our economics is based on the assumption of universal selfishness our science stands on the unchanging ways of God. He is manifest in atom and in galaxy where the eye may see and where the ear may hear. His power and majesty in infinite space are beyond our questioning. But more than his majesty, his nature is our deepest concern. Here again we may turn to the Bible which from the start we were taught to read but which too often lies neglected in our homes. It starts with Genesis, Creation and the Fall. But before it ends it has reached out to Revelation. We see a man, some claimed that he was the son of God; he was pleased to call himself the son of man. He came so that man, whom God had fashioned in his image, might return, prodigal, to his father's home. He was the true teacher who by example proved more than a scientific theory. He demonstrated how this dust of earth might wear angelic garb. He gave proof that martyrs give and saints, no less than scientists, display in every age. He made it clear that life is more than ashes, and revealed what only the pure in heart may see—the nature of God. This teacher challenged the teachers of his day as he challenges teachers today. They tried to ignore him—they tried to kill him—but he lives on. It is our peace that is destroyed, not his. It is to us who have the care of young minds—that a growing generation looks for guidance and example. Are we able to teach? Do we know the way? Have we tried hard to find it? Or have we accepted without question the easy decline in the standard set upon God's image? What have we today to offer better than a robust faith? Have we more to say than the saints, or do we ask the same question as the teenage girl—'What is the point of being noble?' and get back the echoing answer from our agnostic well—'I don't know—don't know—don't know.'

More than 2,000 years ago *Ecclesiasticus* wrote, if we love to hear we shall receive understanding. Today it is still true that "if our wills and ears are bowed we shall be wise."



# *Bible Miracles & The Godhead of Jesus*

FRANK R. HANCOCK

THE claim that Jesus was the Son of God is fairly frequently made in the New Testament. The author of *John* is very emphatic that "the Word was with God, in the beginning, and the Word was God, and without him was not anything made, that was made." This, too, is fundamental to belief in the theory of the redemption.

Apart from *John's* gospel, the evangelists seem to make little of this claim, *Mark* not mentioning it at all. Jesus was almost silent on this point, himself. He never identified himself with the "wonders" worked by God, as recorded in the Old Testament. How could he have done so? Yet, by accepting both the Logos doctrine and the Old Testament, orthodoxy makes Jesus a co-worker with God (if not God Himself) when God "drowned the world", burned Sodom and Gomorrah, sent the plagues on Egypt and stopped the earth's movement around its axis, in order that thousands more of Israel's enemies might be slaughtered. The demoniac terrors of The Flood, and the dreadful firing of the two cities, both involving large numbers of women and children, are cheerfully accepted by the Churches, and are even used as proofs of God's wonderful mercy, because he "saved" *one* family from each catastrophe! Was Jesus in the Godhead then? If so we can make some allowance for the blasphemous claim of the Jehovah Witnesses that it was Jesus himself who was the destroying angel that breathed into the faces of 185,000 Assyrian soldiers as they slept, leaving behind him a huge camp of corpses.

Dare we identify Jesus with the God who works the majority of the Old Testament miracles?

In the Old Testament there are fifty "miracles", forty of which were major wonders. Repellent as they are to our Christian conscience, those "mighty works" are such as might be expected of an omnipotent God. They are on a magnificent scale, terrifying in their nature, decisive in their results. They are unsurpassed in history; we can foresee no rival to them in any future age or people. If they were true, only a God could have conceived and executed them—a terrible God, yes, but God.

The ten plagues on Egypt reaching their climax in the hundreds of thousands dead eldest sons are revolting to us, but nothing more befitting the character of primitive gods was ever recorded. The dry passage by the Israelites over the Red Sea, and the engulfing of Pharaoh's hosts in destruction, is an epic in power. The Fall of Jericho was the spectacular beginning of a new epoch in Israel's history, from which Joshua went on to the greatest "miracle" of

all time, the alleged bringing to a standstill for a whole day of the sun and moon. Says the chronicler of this event, "There was no day like that before it or after it." Just what an impossibility it was, may not have been realised by the ancient simple Jews, whose God had so many times "miraculously" succoured them. The story today invites our contempt. And its purpose was to prolong a massacre! The fire from heaven upon Mount Carmel, and the ensuing killing, by Elijah's orders, of four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal, had a little more reason behind it, but it is also a legend of a barbarians' god. And, says *John*, to the delight of the Churches, Jesus was God—that god.

There are seven unimportant and isolated "miracles" including the bringing back from the dead of two children and a man, but they are spoiled by the same Elisha (who "raised" two of them) avenging himself against some "little children" who called him 'Baldhead' by bringing "two she-bears out of the wood who tore forty and two of them." And apparently Jesus was party to that! We had better dispense with *John's* opinion.

The large majority of the Gospel "miracles" were after the manner of a wonder-working physician. They comprise, chiefly, the healing of unspecified individuals. Then there are two stories of raising from the dead, one of the Widow's son at Nain, reported only in *Luke*, the other the resurrection of Lazarus, recorded only in *John*. It is curious that three out of four evangelists did not consider them worth including in their memoirs of their Master. Or did they never hear of them? These stories are so often evoked to prove the divinity of Jesus, but they are quite equalled by the Old Testament records of the "resurrecting" of the Widow's son at Zarephath, and the Shunammite's son, and the dead man whose body touched the bones of Elisha. The other two great "miracles" were the stilling of the storm on Galilee, and the feeding of the five thousand. The former involves a mighty interference with the course of nature, yet to such an insignificant end. It is very difficult to believe. The latter incident is satisfactorily explained by a version of it that we heard in Galilee: that the five thousand, touched by the example of one open-hearted boy, produced from their copious garments more than enough food to go round. Incidentally, this was a greater wonder than the commonly accepted "miracle".

These four outstanding "miracles" of the Gospels are, however, completely outmatched by the stupendous "wonders" of the Old Testament, which we have noticed, more particularly by the Red Sea passage, and the bringing to a standstill of the sun and moon. (There was also the amazing story of the putting back of the sun by twelve degrees by Isaiah, only to confirm "the Lord's" promise to prolong the life of Hazekiah for a further fifteen years!)

The Old Testament "miracles" were mostly terrifying and often cruel, but they at least bear the stamp of an omnipotent god. Given a god, able and willing to adjust world affairs (or even small Israel's



history) more to his purposes, the Old Testament miracles were never surpassed, were never near being equalled. In comparison how insignificant and historically purposeless are the "miracles" of the Gospels. The benefits they conferred never went beyond the family whose member was blessed. There was no sign in any one of them of God in Jesus working out some connected eternal purpose, or that he was the Light of the World. They gave no indication that he was endeavouring to form a Church, or build his Messianic "Kingdom". Even the narrow saving of men and women from sinful ways was not furthered by any of the miracles. They raised opposition against him, by Pharisees and others who, strange to say, were not in the slightest afraid of this man who could work wonders. He had no faith that his "miracles" would further his Cause. There seems to have been no planned motive behind them. They were the acts we are told, of one the mainspring of whose life was pity. But if he had the power of healing, as well as the over-riding instinct of pity, would he not have used it more widely—much more widely? Every day he was beset by suffering human beings. Yet there are only twenty-three records of healing in three years' ministry. Did he just allow his heart to bleed for the multitude, whilst only helping one here and one there? Indeed in *Luke iv* Jesus seems to uphold this parochial view, which raised the wrath of a crowded synagogue. He argued that there were many widows in Israel in the days of famine, but unto none was Elias sent except to one woman, incidentally outside Israel's borders. He underlined this by reminding them that there were many lepers in Israel in the days of Elisha, but only one person was helped, and he a foreigner, the Syrian Nathan. Similarly, Jesus knew of the universal sickness and disease all around him, but thus excused himself for virtually ignoring it, save on the rarest occasions. Some folks today "love" the miracles of Jesus, because they prove his divine power, and love. Are they never critical? Do they wonder why perhaps only one out of say a hundred thousand was cured? Either his pity was very limited, or he did not possess miraculous powers. Some of us believe that it was his love that was unlimited, knowing that there were no miracles.

The enormous difficulty we have in accepting even the healing "miracles" is well illustrated in the story of the impotent man at the Pool of Bethesda in Jerusalem. The story is half spoiled in advance for us by the incredible tradition that from time to time the pool was visited by an angel, and the first and only person who stepped into it was healed. Jesus is said to have come and found "a great multitude of impotent folk, blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water". And Jesus chooses one man out of this "great multitude", one who, like other sufferers there, had been diseased for thirty-eight years, and heals him. Then they two depart leaving behind them the others, who must have cried and implored him to cure them too. It seems that the claim that Jesus possessed

divine power breaks down—if he was also a loving Saviour.

So on two major points the “miracles” claim breaks down. They were too small to be a manifestation of the power of a Mighty God, and too limited, too tragically few, if Jesus was the soul of Pity. The difficulty is insuperable to those who believe he was God incarnate, and also a great Lover.

The “resurrection”, I and many others have written about before, and is too big an issue to be briefly discussed here.

There are “many miracles”, nearly all unspecified, claimed to have been done by the Apostles. These, of course, minimise the “divine powers” of Jesus, if “miraculous” power, similar to his, was widely held and exercised by ordinary mortals. Yet to Jesus’ credit, he never used his “superhuman powers” to hurt any creature. But he had been crucified less than a year (and Peter could not have forgotten his denial of him, with oaths, on that day of crisis) when Ananias and Sapphira were both put to sudden death by this same Peter, for telling an almost understandable untruth. Yet this same Peter again, had the alleged power to raise Tabitha from the dead. Was “miraculous” power ever vouchsafed, without safeguards, to Peter and other early Christians?

The tide of stories of fresh incredible wonders never ebbs, even in these days of broad daylight. I am writing this article in Sicily, where Roman Catholicism holds sway over ordinary sensible people, but who are predisposed to believe religious fables. The *Times* (4.9.59) told that “Someone was said to have seen a finger in an obscure portrait of Christ move in blessing, and a trail of pilgrims soon led to the scene of the purported miracle in the Sicilian town of Rosolini. This is one of the many reminders recently that the world of religious wonders is still real in Italy”—as they once were in Egypt and Palestine. There always was, and still is, the priest’s vested interest in these fables. Fortunately the Gospel “miracles” could be clean lifted out of them, without hurt to them or Jesus. There is no call whatever to believe in “purported miracles”. Some of us are very certain that the greatness of Jesus was—just Jesus. It needs no other backing.

**Frank R. Hancock** is a Quaker and was a member of the Parliamentary Pacifist Group 1937-39. He has travelled through all the Bible Lands, and has published a non-supernatural life of Jesus: *According to Andrew* (1959), which may be had of the author at “Lisswood”, Hill Brow, Liss, Hants. (10/6d. post free).

**F. Lincoln Ralphs**, M.Sc., LL.B., Ph.D. is the Chief Education Officer for Norfolk. This article was first delivered as an Address, broadcast over the B.B.C. on Education Sunday, 1959. It was made available to this Journal by the kind intermediary offices of the Rt. Hon. J. Chuter Ede.



# *New Look at Philo Judaeus*

ESME WYNNE-TYSON

IN his Introduction to *Selections from the Commentaries and Homilies of Origen*, R. B. Tollinton writes: "Allegory saved the Scriptures for the Church. Taken literally the Old Testament could not have been shown, as against Jewish controversialists, to be Christian literature, nor could either Testament have been defended against the criticism of educated Greeks."

To the layman who enquires into the origins of Orthodox Christianity, it may come as something of a shock to realize what an immense influence the outlook and writings of the famous Jewish allegorist, priest and ambassador, Philo Judaeus, who died an old man in A.D. 50, had on what is called 'Christian' theology.

Even as the theologians of the Early Church were to find that they could not attract Jewish and pagan congregations to the New Faith without making some sort of compromise with their former beliefs, so Philo, the Hellenistic Jew, realized that the literal presentation of his own primitive Scriptures would not be acceptable to the cultured Greek or Roman unless they were allegorized and explained in the Greek idiom. The curious result of his masterly syncretism was an exposition of Judaism which formed a perfect framework to enshrine the Catholic theology evolved by the Alexandrian Fathers. This was, of course, the last thing that Philo, who knew nothing of Jesus and who regarded Moses as the Perfect Man, would have desired. Yet, ironically enough, his work proved to be the means whereby Judaism was perpetuated in Western civilization by the followers of one who intended to purge that ancient religion of many of the errors which, owing to the efforts of Philo and the Church Fathers, have survived under the cloak of the new Faith.

To the Catholic theologians, from Justin to Augustine, Philo's allegorizations must certainly have seemed a God-sent dispensation. For having made the initial mistake of constituting the often very doubtful testimony of the ancient Hebrew prophets the proof of their Master's messiahship, instead of making his nature and works the test, as he so persistently did himself in such passages as *Matt.* 11, 2-6; *John* 5, 36; and *John* 14, 10-11, they were faced with the necessity of persuading the Gentile congregations to hold the Old Testament Scriptures in the same reverence as they were held by the Jews, and to believe that everything therein was the revealed Word of God. But the cultured Gentile world, familiar with the lucid thought of the Greek philosophers, lacked the unsophisticated credulity of the primitive Palestinians. They were familiar with the

idea of the Supreme Good described by Socrates in *The Symposium* as "responsible for the things that are good, but not responsible for the evil", and were not likely to be attracted by the predatory, jealous and vengeful Jehovah of the Hebrew Scriptures. It was therefore necessary that a metaphysical whitewash brush wielded by the intellectual power of a Philo should be applied to this all too frank depiction of his race's highest idea of The Good.

To the modern reader he seems to have been only moderately successful, for his works hold many contradictions. While they are liberally peppered with the assertion that God is wholly good, and makes and is responsible only for the good, the record of His acts, despite the allegorizations, persistently denies this statement, although Philo hopefully represents His predilection for war and vengeance as benign and beneficial chastisement.

But in his Jewish preoccupation with evil—especially the evil of women—Philo constantly forgets the original Greek premise. Fortunately for him, the Fathers of the Early Church, already prejudiced in favour of the Jewish Scriptures by reason of their Master's origin, were equally illogical; and both Justin Martyr in *The Dialogue With Trypho*, and Origen in the *contra Celsum*, were able to ensure that neither Jew nor pagan made, in these works, the sort of objection that would have exposed the weakness of their all too Catholic arguments. And, as time went on, and Judaism and paganism that were both firmly rooted in the ancient religions of Chaldea and Persia, became securely established in the all-embracing Church of Rome, the distinction between them and the teachings found in the four Gospels was gradually obliterated, until today it is forgotten that there ever was such a distinction, except by those who turn to the works of these old Christian theologians and discover, with a shock, what Christians living nearer the days of Jesus Christ actually did believe.

They believed, for instance, that Jesus had cancelled observance of the Sabbath, since, for the Christian, every day must be dedicated to the Lord; so that, as Tertullian wrote in his *Answer to Jews*, "to Christians, Sabbaths are unknown". Physical circumcision was forbidden, as Jesus had taught that purification must be of the mind and spirit. Until the fourth century Christians were absolutist pacifists, Origen stating in the *contra Celsum* that the Lawgiver of the Christians had forbidden entirely the taking of human life since "he did not consider it compatible with his divine legislation to allow the taking of human life in any form at all." (Book 3, 7-8.) Moreover, in those days, spiritual healing was still practised, Origen writing of the Christian healers that "upon those who need healing they use no other invocation than that of the supreme God and of the name of Jesus together with the history about him. By these we have also seen many delivered from serious ailments, and from mental distractions, and madness, and countless other diseases which neither man nor daemons had cured." (*Ibid* 3, 24.)



In other words, until the third century, Christianity, despite certain Pauline innovations, had largely remained the way of non-violence, mercy and healing that we find so clearly depicted in the Gospels. And although Judaic and Mithraic teachings had already infiltrated the Faith that was meant to replace them, they were still only latent as far as Church policy was concerned. It was not until the time of the accommodation with Constantine and the State that they sprang into action, and it became apparent that the old errors that Jesus had striven to eradicate were firmly ensconced in what claimed to be his church; and for this the influence of Philo Judaeus was largely responsible.

In *De la Philosophie d'Origene*, Denis writes, "all the elements of Christian theology were already prepared in the religious and philosophical eclecticism of Philo and other Jewish Hellenists."

That the teachings of Plato should be traceable in the Gospel of Jesus Christ is natural enough. If we accept the fact that Truth is one and indivisible, it is inevitable that we should find the greatest Masters of spiritual thought arriving at the same conclusions. The Truth is no less true because it appeared in primitive sun-worship and the Mystery Religions before it appeared in Judaism and Christianity. The superhuman wisdom that inspired the ten commandments is no less wise because Hammurabi received them from the Sun-god four centuries before Moses descended with them from Sinai. Indeed, as Bernard Shaw reminded us, "The test of a dogma is its universality." We have confidence in the Golden Rule, not only because it works but because it is a central feature of the eleven great world-faiths; and it is a central feature of these Faiths because it has everywhere been found to be true in the experience of mankind.

But while unity at the summit of understanding is natural and inevitable, attempts to synthesize teachings that belong to different phases of evolutionary development must result in a dangerous dichotomy. The gulf between Moses and Socrates was wide enough, but to add, as a third element, a creed that transcended both, and was often in direct conflict with the teachings of the former, was to invite disaster, the fatal disaster of inducing double-mindedness in a large proportion of the human race.

Christianity had a contribution to make to the spiritual life that was diametrically opposed to certain concepts held by Philo's Perfect Man. To the followers of Moses, Justice was the supreme virtue, while the highest Good for the Christian was compassionate Love. Where Justice would stone the Magdalene, compassionate Love would forgive her and set her free. Where Justice would call down fire from heaven, Love would mourn over the intractability of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Where Justice would fight a 'righteous' war, Love would remain compassionate and non-violent even though its reward was the cross. In other words, Christianity included the gentler "womanly" attributes and virtues that Philo

despised and detested. Throughout his entire works he equated Woman with frailty and sin, his attitude being epitomized in the statement that "the female is nothing else but an imperfect male". It is not therefore surprising that throughout his immense works, there is no single reference to the compassionate Love which was the chief characteristic of the nature of the Man of Galilee. Yet it was this love, manifested by each individual, which was, according to Jesus, to save mankind from its own hatred and violence, its inheritance from the jungle. But it was precisely this love, this merciful tenderness and compassion, that was lacking in the moral philosophy of Philo who excluded those virtues that he considered soft, womanly, and beneath the dignity of the male.

"A woman," he pointed out, "by reason of the weakness of her nature, is disinclined to and unfitted for war". She was made out of a rib, instead of, like man and the other animals, out of the earth, that she "might not be of equal dignity with the man".

His despal of women is the obverse side to his exaltation of the male who, according to him, is the creature nearest to God, being equated with mind, while woman is equated with the outward senses, and the serpent—the third member of a trinity which is a prominent feature of his system and which stands for pleasure or lust. This tempts the outward sense which, in turn, captivates the mind, hence, "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat."

Throughout Philo's works the blame for man's sins is thrown upon the woman, despite his superior position in possessing more godlikeness and therefore, presumably, more power.

"There are two kinds of souls—the one a masculine soul, belonging to men; the other a female soul, as found in women. The masculine soul is that which devotes itself to God alone, but the female soul is that which depends upon all the things which are created, and as such are liable to destruction . . . clinging to a generation which admits of an innumerable quantity of changes and variations, when it ought rather to cleave to the unchangeable, blessed, and thrice happy divine nature."

How this lesser soul has the power constantly to lead the higher to forsake its heavenly preoccupations and descend to her more earthly kind is never explained. Enough that woman is the culprit in all cases. Even God, Philo suggests, hesitated to curse man for his fall "since all intellect is a divine inspiration", and blamed first the serpent and then the woman who "being imperfect and depraved by nature, made the beginning of sinning and prevaricating; but the man as being the more excellent and perfect creature, was the first to set the example of blushing, and indeed of every good feeling and action."

This depiction of the bashful male as all that was noble, and who might never have fallen had he not been presented by God with such a dubious 'help-mate', is sustained throughout Philo's

voluminous works. He never seems to have considered that in persistently reviling and denigrating the woman he was criticising the wisdom and conduct of her Maker. Referring to the eating of the forbidden fruit, he writes: "It was suitable that immortality and every good thing should be represented as under the power of the man, and death and every evil under that of the woman."

This attitude towards women is also found among the Mithraists, Mithras being recorded as having so hated the sex that he procreated in a rock! But it is a complete and rather ingenious reversal of the ideas found in the earlier Mystery Religions, those of Ceres, Isis and Cybele where the Goddess was not only the Mother of the Gods but, as such, was considered to be the source of all wisdom and knowledge. Ceres was believed to have been deified for having taught the Greeks the art of agriculture; Cybele was known as the Idaean Goddess who, in her wisdom, tried to deter her impetuous son—the sun-God in the form of Attis—from begetting in the cave of matter, hence the castration ritual which was incorporated, according to the Emperor Julianus, into the Mysteries of Mithras. The Greeks worshipped wisdom in the form of Minerva or Athene. Their Trinity consisted of the Spirit of God, the Virgin Oracle impregnated by that Spirit and the Wisdom, or word of prophecy to which she gave birth. The oracle at Delphi, Herodotus tells us, was known as the Pythoness, evidently the spiritual bride of the Python, that snake-like form which Apollo was said to assume whenever he visited women of eminence, such as the mothers of Alexander the Great and Augustus Caesar. But for the Jews this serpent, worshipped by the Greeks as the embodiment of Wisdom, was regarded as an evil to be resisted, and she who received his spirit and conceived his Word was no virgin, or goddess, but a fallen woman, responsible for the greater fall of the God-like man. It is interesting to note how the spiritual conception and birth of the Logos, or Word was reintroduced into Christianity by the myth of the Nativity. This attempt, however, to restore the theme of the pagan Alma Mater did not prove sufficient to outweigh the Judaic suppression of the Woman and her qualities that had permeated the new Faith, and for which Paul was greatly responsible. The Virgin Mary was at best an intercessor, a mediator between man and her Son. This did not ensure the essential male-female equipoise so evident in the character of Jesus, which made him, as our Example, the saviour of mankind from its lack of balance, the all too great preponderance of masculinity which rated power, violence and physical endurance so far above gentleness, mercy, non-violence and compassionate Love, those 'feminine' attributes that were beneath Philo's consideration. Whatever its source may have been, his prejudice against women effectively prevented him from recognizing the divinity of true Womanhood. Obsessed with his all-male conception of deity, he never realized that what he was worshipping was only one half of the Ideal Man who had already appeared on



earth, unknown to him, in the person of Jesus the Nazarene. For Philo, the ideal being was Moses, the lawgiver of his race, whom he describes as "The greatest and most perfect man that ever lived"

We have only to consider the thoughts and acts of that man—his merciless demands for the extirpation of alien cultures (*Ex.* 34, 11-16); his revolting and cruel directions for animal sacrifice (*Lev.* 3 and 4); his demand that a man should be stoned for picking up sticks on the Sabbath day (*Numbers* 15, 33-35), his obsession with the law, his entire lack of compassion, and compare these with the healing, merciful, dynamically loving Christ, to realize how far Philo's ideal fell short of the sort of man who must replace the primitive man of savagery and violence, that half-man, half-animal depicted in the Old Testament. But by ensuring amongst the Gentiles the same Bibliolatry, and the same unquestioning reverence for the Hebrew lawgiver that already affected the Jews, Philo Judaeus and the Alexandrian Fathers who borrowed so liberally from his teachings, perpetuated values that were intended to be replaced by the more evolved idea of the Highest Good found in the New Testament. The attempted acceptance of both these Testaments or Covenants as being of equal spiritual value has resulted in such violations of the Christian ethic as the Crusades, humans being tortured on the rack and burnt at the stake, the massacre of the Albigenses, generals who went to battle with the Bible in one hand and a rifle in the other, and, finally, a Christendom that has indulged in two world-wars in less than half a century, and insists on possessing the H-bomb. None of these things could possibly have arisen from the acceptance and practice of the teachings found in the Gospels. They could, and have, arisen from the perpetuation of Judaic and pagan influences preserved in the Church under the cloak of Christianity. And Philo Judaeus undoubtedly played a considerable part in bringing this about.

Mrs. Esme Wynne-Tyson is a novelist who also contributes to many leading journals in Great Britain, sometimes under the pseudonym Diotima. Previous articles 'Philosophy *versus* Religion' in Vol. 12, Pt. 2 and 'Mithras, the Invincible' in Vol. 13, Pt. 1.

## *The Creative Writer in a Technological Society*

TOM WARDLE

TWO ways present themselves of discussing the writer's place in our society. First, it may be seen as something sociologically determined; he is the product of an organic social process, a process

which obeys rules not made by him or even his kind. He is subordinate to the process, and his function is to assist the process. Hence his place will be wherever the social mechanism is weak. His creative imagination will be a tool to mould opinion, to stimulate activity. He may be free to dredge in the deeps of myth and folk-story, he may resurrect old heroes of the past or invent new ones so long as his work has the desired effect—to strengthen the system, to confirm the people in the social norms which have been decided for them by men other than creative writers.

This has, of course, been the case pre-eminently in Marxist countries. The term “proletarian culture”, which Lenin invented, stands for the subservience of all artistic and literary activity to the needs of the proletarian revolution and its subsequent dictatorship. Those needs are utilitarian; greater production, unity of behaviour and a rigid obedience to discipline. Marxists are sufficiently conscious of the psychological springs of action and attitudes to know that ultimately the only form of discipline which is decisive is a discipline which, if it does not come from within, at least finds a ready compliance from within. The task of proletarian culture became that of entirely reconstructing the *mores* of the people in a way that would make them eager defenders of the totalitarian system in which they were enmeshed.

The writer, more than any other artist, was the most effective instrument of this conditioning process. He became an employee of the state, able to publish only with the state's approval, subject to withering criticism of disciplinary action when he ceased to meet the demands of the state, subject to imprisonment or death if he chose to defy the state. In the totalitarian society, the place of the writer is specific; it is where the state puts him.

Significantly, the rise of the new totalitarian societies has been accompanied by the development of the technological and scientific order of life, each to some extent forcing the growth of the other. In Russia, the sudden appearance of machines, the revolutionising of agriculture, the introduction of scientific methods of management, came as a vicious assault upon the old tradition-bound, peasant way of life. No matter how much they may have applauded the revolution, personalities were still shattered and resentments flared into life when the new ways were forced upon them. Only the writers, the poets, the playwrights could bridge the gap between the elaborate, ritualistic past and the iron present. They did their job well. They composed sonnets to tractors, they set high dramas in rolling mills, they created a new cult (which was really an old cult transformed) of the Father-leader, the living embodiment of the Fatherland.

In these circumstances it is seriously to be questioned whether the activity of the writer could be regarded as creative. He was writing to order, and yet, because in many cases he was himself in sympathy with the object of his instructions, he was not without

creative enterprise in the fulfilment of them. Mayakovsky and Ehrenberg might have been tools of dictatorship, but they were none the less highly imaginative and subtle tools.

This reference to the place of the writer in totalitarian societies has its wider implications. Commensurate with the expansion of technology has gone the building of a closer, less personal organisation of industry and society. Machines have raised psychological problems, but the kind of organisation necessary for the effective control of machines has raised even more. Whole societies have now to be organised as production units. Every aspect of the national life comes more and more to be seen in terms of its relation to the need for higher production levels to meet the demands of the nation's economy and its military commitments. There is a danger that, if this kind of objective becomes the sole criterion of social good, writers and artists will find themselves under a heavier compulsion to speak in the way that will be approved, or at least in a way that will not run counter to the general ethos of the state.

\* \* \*

This brings us to the consideration of the second way in which the subject of this essay may be viewed. Supposing the place of the writer to be something that is determined by himself, by his own call, his own vocational sense, what can we make of the role of the creative writer in a free social situation?

In an essay, "Inside the Cage", published in 1955, Stephen Spender writes: "Acceptance of the division of the world into the truth of science and the pseudo-statements of the imagination is to lock poetry inside the cage—we live today in a world with two futures—of total annihilation, or of revolution different from any envisaged by politics. It is impossible to think of survival only in terms of material progress. In regard to the future, we are now like Pascal taking his bet on eternity. We can take our bet on survival of the physical world only through living and working creatively."

Yet Spender is regarded today, even by many of his contemporaries, as a disillusioned idealist, trying to make sense out of a world where there is no sense, trying to recover values which have long since disappeared.

Sartre, Camus, Orwell, Samuel Beckett, John Osborne, these are the types of literature in the western world today. Writing of Beckett's play, *Fin de Partie*, Kenneth Tynan says: "His purpose is neither to move nor to help us. For him man is a pygmy who convives at his own inevitable degradation. There, says Beckett, stamping on the face of mankind; there, that is how life is. And when protest is absent, the step from 'how life is' to 'how life should be' is horrifyingly short." The same symbolism is used by Orwell in "1984". Describing the future he says, "imagine a boot stamping on a human face—for ever." For Camus and Sartre, life is a "door opening on to nowhere". It is all a reflection of the misery to which philosophy has been reduced, paralleled by the new orthodoxy



among theologians. Life is just a morass of sin and meaninglessness. Belsen and Hiroshima are characteristic of life, we are all entailed in horror, bound in shame which is itself only ridiculous for there is no point even in shame; we perpetrate wickedness, but it does not matter, for we do what we do, and that is all. The Barths, the Brunners, the Niebuhrs seek to rescue us from despair by bringing God in, to act arbitrarily, without motive or justification or in response to need or merit. He is the one thing that is not meaningless, but still there is no gospel of hope, for it is not for us to say how or if we shall be saved.

The existentialism of the neo-orthodox theologians is less convincing than the novelists' for their God is of a piece with the meaningless world they inhabit. His is continuously absent from this world, at least in our day.

What is the "place" of these typically creative writers in our society? They would stoutly deny that they have any place, that they "fit in" anywhere. Almost certainly they will accept that they are themselves creatures of their time, but they will go further and say that it is this time which exposes the futility of all times. Nuclear bombs, international psychosis, spontaneous violence in society, dictatorship and the coming triumph of the machine over man, —what do all these reveal but that the game is up, the play is over?

The commerce between the writer and his time has always been a subtle thing. He cannot emancipate himself from his time, and indeed the modern trend has been to regard him as less than an artist if he tries to; but there are times and times. The events of the past sixty years have surely been more cataclysmic than any in history. It is not only that suffering and inhumanity have been visited on the race to an extent wider than ever before; the depredations of Alexander or Genghis Khan were equally ruinous, equally unnerving for those within the orbit of their adventures. No, what is characteristic of this day is the violent disruption of continuity between one generation and the next. All previous historical change of a major order has been effected over fairly long periods of time. The changes were first pioneered by those who were psychologically prepared for them, and communicated to the masses in terms of modifications *within existing traditions*. Buddha within Brahmanism; Jesus within Judaism; Paul within the Judaic-Hellenistic framework; Luther within Catholicism; Wesley within Anglicanism; the Mediaeval Schoolmen and the Renaissance philosophers within the context of existing religious tradition.

The Technological Revolution is a revolution of a different kind. Lewis Mumford sees the development of "technics" as an unbroken process originating with the discovery of the use of fire, but he is prepared to recognise a rapid acceleration with the invention of "machines to make machines". Whether this constituted a change in kind or only of degree is an academic matter; the fact is that a change of considerable significance did occur. The same might be

said of the recent advances in the control of new sources of power. The important aspect is that these developments took place, as it were, independently of the prevailing metaphysics. Though scientific thought was doubtless stimulated at the high points of intellectual and cultural activity, it did not, largely, emerge as a discernible consequence of any particular doctrine or school of thought. Science became a "method" on its own, as it remains today. Scientific thinkers developed the technique of inductive reasoning in clear contradistinction to deductive methods. They argued that they began with the facts and proceeded from there. Whatever may be said about the validity or otherwise of this argument, their approach was sufficiently detached from the domination of Aristotelean logic, the precious method of the Church, to bring them into disrepute and often danger. A. N. Whitehead describes the scientific movement of the Enlightenment as in a way an anti-intellectual movement. It was an appeal to the facts, not to logical reasoning.

Through the vicissitudes of the seventeenth century, the scientific movement emerged into the triumph of the eighteenth. Yet what was a triumph for the scientific spirit became nearly a disaster for the Humanism which had early been associated with it. Scepticism prevailed, religious belief declined and society became increasingly decadent.

The nineteenth century saw new trends, especially for Britain. The Industrial Revolution, the most tremendous technological upsurge to date, made possible a vast extension of commerce, trade and culture. The new power was early applied to means of transport. The great towns sprang up overnight, railways spanned the country and ships the world, and with all this change came the inevitable crop of new problems, personal and social. The novelist came into his own, so did the preacher. The change was great enough to fire men of imagination and sensitivity to wrestle with the issues it produced, yet not so great that they were overwhelmed. By the late nineteenth century, with the population soaring, with slums everywhere, and working people beginning to stir angrily, there were writers in plenty commenting on, reflecting, interpreting the meaning of the times. Carlyle and Emerson, Eliot, Ruskin and Morris and the poets were digging deep into the origins of the emotions of the day. Dickens, Kingsley, Tolstoy and Ibsen began the line of sociological novelists and playwrights continued by Shaw and Bennet, Galsworthy and Wells. It was a time of mixed feelings. On the one hand there was the oppression and the depression of those who suffered the worst effects of industrialisation; there was a grossness, an inhumanity about it all—iron and fire and smoke, blackened landscapes, the crudity of the newly-rich, the abuses of power, the degeneracy of the poor. Yet, on the other hand, there was the prospect of all this mighty power being turned to some nobler purpose, the means to the Kingdom of Heaven were at hand; all that was needed now was the will.

So compelling was this dream that it persisted far into the twentieth century, even beyond the First World War. Yet with that war a new note began to be heard. The war poets who had sung so bravely, so confidently, turned sour. The hopes of men got bogged down in Flanders mud, yet the great impulse of optimism that had come out of the nineteenth century was not yet spent. The war was an incident, albeit a trying, exhausting incident; it was historically necessary to clear away the last obstacles to the new society. The war ended and the new society was born. It was born in Munich and St. Petersburg.

This was the period of the Waste Land. As the hopes of men for a new birth faded into despair with the Great Depression, the intellectuals turned to a morbid introspection. Their thoughts coloured by the aimlessness of the times and the impact of Freud's psychology, they dredged about inside themselves and brought up what they found. Joyce and James and Proust and Kafka became the fashion. Such social comment as there was bore a tinge of this same morbidity—D. H. Lawrence, T. S. Eliot, Steinbeck. *All Quiet on the Western Front*; *Love on the Dole*, *The Grapes of Wrath* revealed the new sorrow which had come to replace the old, a sorrow all the more poignant because there now did not seem any prospect of release from it.

Yet hope was not all gone. From Berlin and Rome and Moscow came fresh voices, confident, strong. That they were also strident voices went unnoticed—till the Second World War. Now they are known for what they were.

Where are we now? The Technological Revolution has done three things supremely. It has undermined the old theological bases of society to such an extent that we are today what Alisdair McIntyre calls "a society without metaphysics"; it has made possible a kind of warfare which reaches into every home, spreads over the entire face of the earth and holds over us all the technically feasible possibility of annihilation; it has produced a form of social and industrial organisation which renders the human mind redundant over large areas of its operation. One writer has it: "The Second Industrial Revolution, the revolution of electronics, is doing for the human mind what the First Industrial Revolution did for the human body."

In such circumstances it is not surprising that literature and philosophy should have taken the course of nihilism. It is a reflection of what imaginative people feel today, and what millions of others try to avoid feeling, by seeking the ingenious avenues of escape that now assume the proportions of great industries themselves.

Yet the task of the *creative* writer has always been something more than merely to reflect his time. Interpretation is not without value, but neither is it the essence of great literature. The creative writer has always pointed beyond his time to values secreted within the imagination, to hopes and visions mysteriously maintained within the heart even in moments of apparent despair.



Machines can manufacture better than men; they can calculate better than men; some say they can translate better than men; they are already able to perform logical reasoning within certain limitations with an inerrancy of which man cannot always be sure: but they cannot imagine, they cannot hope, they cannot love.

What is to be the next stage in literature? Might it not be, that having descended into the depths of existentialism it may find that it can go no further and that if it is to move at all, if men are to write at all, there must be a move in another direction, and that there is only one way left to go—upwards?

Criticism, of all kinds has become a bigger activity than creation. Literary criticism, historical criticism, philosophical criticism have become techniques partaking of all the characteristics of the scientific method; yet they are dealing with material which in the last resort is not assessable in terms of scientific criteria. Ultimately literature seeks to communicate that which cannot be communicated by words alone. It must ever fall short of its inner objective, for there is no means other than the totality of human behaviour which can communicate the profundities of experience. In all great literature there must be the element of the prophetic; that which not only reveals us to ourselves as we truly are, but which derives the significance of this revelation from an implied contrast with our *potential* selves. Perhaps the continual frustration which literature mirrors may spring from the fact that this potentiality is not realisable within the human condition. But the prophetic challenge remains.

What is the place of the creative writer in a technological and scientific society? To live with it, to know its heights and depths and to re-discover within its complexities, its fears, its dislocations, the Man who has made it; to find its meaning and to restore to Man, doubtless on a higher and subtler plane, the purpose which has brought him to this point. The place of the creative writer today is not in abject submission to the mechanical, despotic agencies of totalitarianism, nor in an equally abject surrender to darkness and emptiness; his place is at the centre of the confusion, sculpting dignity out of pain, weaving hope out of resignation. His place is:

To love and bear; to hope till hope creates  
From its own wreck the thing it contemplates."

**Tom Wardle**, has just arrived in Australia to take charge of All Souls Unitarian Church, Melbourne, after a two-year Ministry at Kendal. Trained for the Ministry at the Unitarian College, Manchester, he was previously a journalist and lecturer. He visited the U.S.A. in 1955 for the Society of Friends. Previous articles: 'Humanism and Theism' in No. 28, and 'Existentialism and the Liberal Opportunity' in No. 33.

# *Jung and Human Evil*

RONALD M. MAZUR

The evil that comes to light in man and that undoubtedly dwells within him is of gigantic proportions, so that for the Church to talk of original sin and to trace it back to Adam's relatively innocent slip-up with Eve is almost a euphemism. The case is far graver and is grossly underestimated.—C G Jung.<sup>1</sup>

THE Jesuit psychologist Raymond Hostie, in his *Religion and the Psychology of Jung*, observes that, "All Jung's inquiries into metaphysics and theological problems are concerned essentially with three points which can be summed up in the following questions: What is the psychological significance of the mandala centre? What insight does analytical psychology give into the problem of evil? What psychological meaning is to be ascribed to the doctrine of the Trinity?"<sup>2</sup> It is Jung's answer to this second question which will be the primary concern of this paper. Obviously, however, before we can understand the implications of Analytical Psychology for the metaphysics of Evil, we must first consider Jung's psychological theory.

The major contributions of Jung to depth psychology revolve around two constellations of concepts: the process of polar compensation as the function of autonomous complexes; and the transcendent, synthesizing function of archetypal symbols as manifest in the individuation process. Jung's basic premise is that the psyche, a non-physical "space" which serves as the framework in which mental phenomena occur, is a reality which operates according to laws which cannot be reduced to explanations that do not accept the psyche on its own terms. Libidinal (psychic) energy is the life power of the psyche, and it functions according to a stable structure of relations in the same manner and with the same predictability as do the scientific laws of the physical realm. The problem is to find the causal key which will expose psychic phenomena to rational understanding—on the phenomenological level if on no other. Now, the main principle which Jung has postulated to chart the movement of the psychic process is his "principle of opposites", a concept based on his assumption that psychic tensions caused by the presence of conflicting opposites are the mainspring for the movement of libidinal energy. As Jung says, ". . . just as the high always longs for low and hot for cold, so all consciousness, perhaps without being aware of it, seeks its unconscious opposite, lacking which it is doomed to stagnation, congestion, and ossification. Life

<sup>1</sup> Carl G. Jung, *The Undiscovered Self*, p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> Raymond Hostie, *Religion and the Psychology of Jung*, p. 184.

is born only of the spark of opposites.”<sup>3</sup> As a matter of fact, “the greater the tension between the pair of opposites, the greater will be the energy that comes from them.”<sup>4</sup> Jung’s theory of psychological types is an example of his application of this principle to personality classification. Inasmuch as there is no flow of libidinal energy unless there is a tension of opposite forces, it is necessary to be aware of the attitude which opposes the conscious mind so as to restrain the tension from becoming explosive or unbearable. The tensions occur because the law of opposites is a compensating function. For every conscious attitudinal configuration (gestalt) there is an unconscious constellation which serves as an inferior counter-function that tries to prevent the over-development of personality to the exclusion of many other possible, and necessary, aspects of a rich and full psychic life; the full range of appropriate emotional responses must be allowed expression for a healthy mental life. This unconscious constellation sometimes repressed, and sometimes still in the potential stage, is inferior, not in terms of the objective evaluation, but in terms of the secondary or passive roles which it is forced to assume in light of the characteristics consciously developed and emphasized. Now, the essence of the inferior constellation is that it functions autonomously as a complex of associated psychic contents. The autonomous constellation or complex is almost like a smaller personality within the person; “. . . it is independent, it attacks, it fascinates and so spins us about that we are no longer masters of ourselves and can no longer rightly distinguish between ourselves and others.”<sup>5</sup> These autonomous complexes, however, are not necessarily indicative of an abnormal condition, for as Ira Progoff explains it, “Such psychic ‘splits’ are actually necessary if the individual is to specialize the direction of his energies so as to accomplish some particular work. The ‘autonomous complex’ provides, very often, the ‘flavour’ and distinctiveness of an individual personality. It becomes a danger point only when, operating as a ‘partial system’, it goes too far out of relation to the rest of the psyche, and a condition of unbalance results.”<sup>6</sup> Yet, engendering, as they necessarily do, a tension of conflicting functions and attitudes, the complexes set free psychic energy which, although following no set pattern of reaction, moves in a general progressive or regressive direction. The progression phase of libido movement takes place when there is balance and harmony between the psychic tensions. When the tensions are thus transcended, a creative period follows in which the person turns his energies outward in a constructive manner, precipitating in him, meanwhile, a feeling of well-being and confident vitality. But when the equilibrium of the tensions is shattered by confrontation with an obstacle

<sup>3</sup> Jung, *Two Essays in Analytical Psychology*, p. 64.

<sup>4</sup> Jung, *Contributions to Analytical Psychology*, p. 17. Quoted in Ira Progoff, *Jung’s Psychology and its Social Meaning*, p. 62.

<sup>5</sup> Jung, *TEAP*, p. 68.

<sup>6</sup> Progoff, *op. cit.*, p. 82.



frustrating to the progressive activity, a regressive movement of the psyche sets in. With the increase of tension caused by the friction of the opposites there is a corresponding increase in the level of libidinal energy. And, not being able to express itself in an outward progression movement, the energy accumulates, builds up pressure, and then finally turns inward, descending first into the region of the Personal Unconscious, and then boring deeper through the lower layers of the Objective Unconscious. With the introduction of these last terms we can now consider Jung's other major theory: the Individuation Process.

In differentiating between the Personal Unconscious and the Objective Unconscious, Jung developed that most important single concept which forced him to move away from the Freudian school. Jung assimilated Freud in the sense that Jung's Personal Unconscious is essentially the same as Freud's Repressed Unconscious. The contents of the Personal Unconscious are based on reactions of the individual to his personal experience, and they are unique to the individual who has had these experiences. It contains all experiences that have been repressed, along with suppressed painful ideas and apperceptions below the threshold of consciousness. Whereas the discovery of these active unconscious contents was the major contribution of Freud, for Jung these personal contents are but a superficial layer to an even deeper unconscious world which is open to the individual independent of the influences of his own experience. It is into this impersonal unconscious abyss that the regression movement of libidinal energy enters. As Jung states it, "The personal layer ends at the earliest memories of infancy, but the collective layer comprises the pre-infantile period, that is, the residues of ancestral life. Whereas the memory-images of the personal unconscious are, as it were, filled out, because they are images personally experienced by the individual, the archetypes of the collective unconscious are not filled out, because they are forms not personally experienced. On the other hand, when psychic energy regresses, going beyond the period even of early infancy, and breaks into the legacy of ancestral life, then mythological images are awakened; there are the archetypes."<sup>7</sup> It should be noted in passing that this phrase "collective unconscious" is actually a misnomer. As Proffo is quick to point out, the word "collective" is intended by Jung simply as the opposite to personal and subjective psychic contents, hence it is "objective"; and the term "unconscious" has negative connotations because of its Freudian usage, whereas it is an affirmative, positive factor in Jung's framework, since it plays a creative role in psychic life. Now, the problem of the definition of these archetypes is one of the most difficult tasks for the student of Jung's thought. It is difficult because it is the concept most ambiguously and confusingly presented by Jung, a writer who has difficulty communicating even when he is sure of what he wants to say. What effect can

<sup>7</sup> Jung, *TEAP*, p. 87.

primitive mythological images have on us, and why and how is it that we are aware of them? We shall briefly tackle the 'how', 'what', 'why' of archetypes in that order.

In attempting to define how archetypes arise out of the "treasure-house of primordial images" we find ourselves faced with two differing possibilities of interpretation or of some combination thereof. Either archetypes are some sort of intuitively apprehended ideas or they are structurally inherent constituents of the mind: they are *a priori* ideas or they are mental categories transmitted through heredity. The point that Jung is trying to make understood is that history, with cross-cultural references, continually manifests variants of a core of basic ideas. "The fact is," he says, "that certain ideas exist almost everywhere at all times and they can even spontaneously create themselves quite apart from migration and tradition. They are not made by the individual, but they rather happen—they even force themselves upon the individual's consciousness. This is not platonic philosophy but empirical psychology."<sup>8</sup> In explaining this connection of modern symbolism with ancient theories and beliefs he asserts that, "Such a continuity can only exist if we assume a certain unconscious condition *carried on by biological inheritance*. By this assumption I naturally do not mean an inheritance of representations, which would be difficult if not impossible to prove. The inherited quality, I fancy, must rather be something like a possibility of regenerating the same or at least similar ideas. I have called the possibility 'archetype', which means a *mental precondition* and a characteristic of the cerebral function."<sup>9</sup> This definition seems to carry contradictory philosophical distinctions, or else it implies that ideas are biologically inherited, a concept which would make all notions of Truth either relative or irrelevant. On the other hand, the phrase "mental precondition" implies that he is groping to qualify his concept in an important way. If we further pursue his definitions of these universal contents of the Objective or Transpersonal Unconscious we can distinguish at least four different theories of origination.

1. The biological: we have already noted his notion of heredity. Elsewhere he explains the *anima* archetype as "presumably a psychological representation of the minority of female genes in a male body."<sup>10</sup>

2. The *a prioristic* ideas: in speaking of the discovery in physics of the law of conservation of energy, Jung says that "the explanation can only be this: the idea of energy and its conservation must be a primordial image that was dormant in the collective unconscious."<sup>11</sup> Also, these ideas are intuited, that is, they "often contain a superior analysis or insight or knowledge which consciousness has not been able to produce."<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Jung, *Psychology and Religion*, p. 4.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12. Underline mine.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.

<sup>11</sup> Jung, *TEAP*, p. 78.

<sup>12</sup> Jung, *PR*, p. 49.

3. The "innate" view: this view is related to the *a prioristic* concept, but whereas the latter implies an external, objective order of ideas, the former emphasizes the inherent categorical nature of the idea structure in the form of propensities of thought structure. He says that, "the primordial images are the most ancient and the most universal 'thought-forms' of humanity".<sup>13</sup> And he says, "the archetype is a kind of readiness to produce over and over again the same or similar mythical ideas. Hence it seems as though what is impressed upon the unconscious were exclusively the subjective fantasy—ideas aroused by the physical process. Therefore we may take it that archetypes are recurrent impressions made by subjective reactions."<sup>14</sup>

4. The historical view: this is a very interesting explanation of the mode of archetypal transmission which assumes them to be "deposits of the constantly repeated experiences of humanity".<sup>15</sup> This historical view, if I may call it such, has a curious relationship with the naturalistic, biological view, for these deposits of ideas have been "stamped on the human brain for acons".<sup>16</sup> Perhaps it is at this point that it would be best to expose Jung's unfortunate confusion of mind with brain—a point at which, among others, his unexamined naturalistic premises hinder the progress and lucidity of his thought. Why he should feel the necessity of rooting psychic phenomena biologically is a fact which is incomprehensible in light of his emphatic assertions concerning the reality of the psyche. As he himself says, "It is almost ridiculous prejudice to assume that existence can only be physical".<sup>17</sup> Jung is the first to admit to his lack of philosophical subtlety; he naively thinks he can theorize to some hypothetical brink of metaphysics and then dump the problem in someone else's armchair—and I emphasize this point, not pleading confusion on the part of Jung, but primarily to underscore his own brand of scientism which I believe is the foundation for his thought structure. At any rate, I perceive that this historical view implicitly contains some interesting possibilities for elaboration, of which even Jung may not have been consciously aware: namely, that the Transpersonal Unconscious is a *dynamic* force, admitting of change and development caused by historically selective variants in ideational emphasis, on both a cultural and a racial basis. This type of position is indeed implicit in Jung, for he says, "No doubt, on an earlier and deeper level of psychic development, where it is still impossible to distinguish between an Aryan, Semitic, Hamitic, or Mongolian mentality, all human races have a common collective psyche. But with the beginning of racial differentiation essential differences are developed in the collective psyche as well. For this reason we cannot transplant the spirit of a foreign race *in globo* into our own mentality without sensible injury to the latter . . ."<sup>18</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Jung, *TEAP*, p. 76.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> Jung, *PR*, p. 11.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 79.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Jung, *TEAP*, p. 317.



Thus, Jung is admitting to unique unconscious variants from the basic universal unconscious ground which operate on a smaller collectivity in the form of racial characteristics. But the idea I am suggesting has a broader theoretical framework, for I think it is possible for experimental residues to accumulate as an effective force within differing cultures of the same race. Furthermore, whereas Jung sometimes is reductionist in his historical method, I would suggest that archetypes can have a dynamic, changing, or developing character. What remains to be done then is to formulate a theory that does for Jung what Gordon Allport's "functional autonomy of motives" theory did for Freudian reductionist instinct theory; that is, to hypothesize and document a theory of the "historical functional autonomy of archetypes". It would then seem reasonable to assume that these dynamic archetypes receive permanent cultural mutations and adaptations which then in turn have the influence of a sort of cultural apperceptive mass.

In any case, the individual is left to his own academic resources of interpretation in regard to the nature of the causal mode of these primordial images. The four schemes outlined above are not, of course, mutually exclusive, and for my own part I would pursue the possibilities of what I have labelled the historical view. The most general aspects I would emphasize are the universal, inherent constitutional ground of archetypes—the question of their physiological basis being left open—and the teleological character of their function. Before passing on to the "what" and the "why" (relative categories) of the archetypes, it would be very relevant to cite Progoff's interesting and fruitful interpretation of the archetypes which he presents in his *The Death and Rebirth of Psychology*.

Just as the proto-images (the "meaning" of every pattern of behavior as contained in an image latent in the organism) function to provide the essential purpose and drive behind animal patterns of behavior, so the archetypes fulfill the equivalent function in man. They are not the instincts themselves, but they guide the instincts. They give the instincts their directions. They give them form. They outline the stages and the phases which the instincts must pass in human life. The archetypes are very close to the instincts, and neither is able to function without the other; but they are the opposite poles of the process by which the individuality of the person is eventually achieved.<sup>19</sup>

Thus we see that Progoff, too, emphasizes the biological (instinctual) tie and the teleological orientation.

Now for the "what" of the archetypes. While Jung speaks of archetypes as having meaning and as being ideas, Progoff is emphatic in his renunciation of an "innate idea" interpretation. And I think he is justified. Yet since it would be meaningless to speak of un-

<sup>19</sup> Progoff, *The Death and Rebirth of Psychology*, pp. 174–5. Sentence in parenthesis abstracted from p. 170.

differentiated ideas, what are we to make of Jung's terminology? The essence of this position is that the primordial images, while not in themselves specific, or even general ideas, are symbols, autonomous and spontaneous in nature, which orient the individual toward attitudes appropriate for his condition. Yet the symbol, while being a manifestation of complexes of ancestral experience, is, at the same time, the vehicle of life's meaning. "The symbol is, on the one hand, the primitive expression of the unconscious, while, on the other hand, *it is an idea corresponding to the highest intuition produced by consciousness.*"<sup>20</sup> The role of consciousness in the production of intuitions, and the meaning content of the symbol are difficult to reconcile with other utterances of Jung's in which the rational, conscious function is deprecated, and the symbol is held to be "living" only as long as its content is not rationally articulated in a satisfactory manner. The concept of the symbol and an understanding of its functions were thoughts with which Jung had long grappled, and it is therefore not surprising to find throughout his works contradictory statements regarding this subject. It is thus important to distinguish those aspects of the concept which still play a vital role in his thinking in order not to concern ourselves with notions that were only stages in the development of his thought. Hostie has analyzed the evolution of Jung's understanding of the symbol, and he finds that, "In 1907 Jung had believed that the precision of the sign and the allegory made them more important than the symbol with its complexity."<sup>21</sup> But, by 1940, this opinion had been totally reversed, for Jung now held that, "Only signs and allegories are simple. For a symbol always covers a complex reality which is so far beyond any verbal equivalent that it can never be experienced all at once."<sup>22</sup> Indeed, Jung had gone so far in realizing the depth, complexity, and non-rationality of the symbol that he defined a "living", a dynamic symbol as, ". . . the expression of a thing not to be characterized in any other or better way. The symbol is alive only insofar as it is pregnant with meaning. But if its meaning is born out of it, i.e., if that expression should be found which formulates the sought, expected, or divined thing better than the hitherto accepted symbol, then the symbol is *dead*, i.e., it possesses only a historical significance."<sup>23</sup> In other words, if interpreted solely on this level, it would appear that Jung has reduced or withdrawn the "meaning" of the symbol to an esoteric, mystical sphere which, apparently, can only be apprehended intuitively and which has no contact with the rational, cognitive function.

But Hostie makes a mistake in dropping his analysis as he does at this point (1940), for as early as 1939, with the publication of the *Integration of Personality*, the archetypes could have been interpreted as having a noetic function, as being categories of intuitive

<sup>20</sup> Richard Wilhelm and Carl Jung, *The Secret of the Golden Flower*, p. 105.

<sup>21</sup> Hostie, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> Jung, *Psychological Types*, p. 602.

understanding. Here, a mediating position is implicit, a position which (although not formulated explicitly by Jung) can allow the archetypal symbol to be open to rational understanding without vitiating its driving power. In fact, his essay, *The Structure of the Unconscious*, written around the year 1916, contains the possibility of such a third view. It was in this essay that he discussed the hermeneutic significance of the symbol, a principle which understands the symbol as, "an attempt to elucidate, by means of analogy, something that still belongs entirely to the domain of the unknown or something that is yet to be."<sup>24</sup> Although at this stage he is still confusing the terms "symbol" and "analogy", and although in the same section he warns against destroying the authentic value of the symbol through rational analysis, the major implicit point is that the oneiric symbol has a communicative function. And this must of necessity be so, or else the dream could have no possible significance for analysis if it could not in some way be understood. It is also interesting to note that Jung's suggested hermeneutic method of treating dreams is based on a historical interpretation of symbol values which he takes *prima facie*. This method "consists in making successive additions of other analogies to the analogy given in the symbol: in the first place of subjective analogies produced at random by the patient, and then of objective analogies found by the analyst in the course of erudite research. This procedure widens and enriches the initial symbol, and the final outcome is an infinitely complex and varied picture, in which certain 'lines' of psychological development stand out as possibilities that are at once individual and collective."<sup>25</sup>

It is therefore in light of this third possibility for interpreting the significance of the symbol that Jung's following statement does not seem contradictory to his strong emphasis on the non-rational nature of the symbol. Says he, "The living symbol cannot come to birth in an inert or poorly-developed mind, for such a man will rest content with the already existing symbols offered by established tradition. Only the *passionate yearning of a highly developed mind*, for whom the dictated symbol no longer contains the highest reconciliation in one expression, *can create a new symbol*."<sup>26</sup>

The "why" of the archetype is, of course, simply the "how" and the "what" pursued to a further speculative degree (but based on empirical foundations). The conceptual framework under which this aspect of the issue is formulated in Jung's thought is known as the process of Individuation. We recited previously Progoff's interpretation of the archetypes as the "formative aspects of the instincts". His final conclusion is that, "The archetypes are the psychic devices that nature has provided for taking human instincts in the direction in which they are *intended*—in which they are *equipped*, and indeed, in which they *need*—to go."<sup>27</sup> The instinct in this case is the most basic (and human) one of all, namely, the striving for

<sup>24</sup> Jung, *TEAP*, p. 299.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> Jung, *PT*, p. 607. Underline mine.

<sup>27</sup> Progoff, *DRP*, p. 175.



self-realization. And the archetypes spontaneously manifested are the major ones of the Self, the Shadow, and the Anima. These archetypal symbols, originally residents of the Transpersonal Unconscious, arise into the mainstream of psychic life upon the emergency call of the regressive movement of the libido, a movement evoked, it will be remembered, when the tension of personality opposites is jarred by frustration or ill treatment into a state of disequilibrium. When this situation occurs, the archetypal symbols, acting as autonomous partial systems, function unconsciously as a rallying point for the disabled psyche, and, if successfully assimilated into consciousness, they provide a unifying synthesis of psyche contents, thus enabling the libidinal energy to move constructively forward again in the progression movement. This process is therefore also known as the Transcendent Function. The basic confusion which arises at this point of the discussion concerns the degree of initiative and spontaneity which the archetypal complexes assume. For at certain points in his formulation, Jung gives the impression that this process of the Transcendent Function is mechanically precise and automatic in spite of the conscious level and attitudes of the individual. Jung opens himself to severe criticism by his implication that the Individuation process inevitably unfolds in every individual. He speaks of the archetypes as arising fatefully, spontaneously, as working in spite of consciousness, in fact, as being superior to consciousness. However, it is Jung's intent, in describing the law of Individuation, simply to emphasize its unconscious character and to demonstrate it as a natural process of the psyche. But it is also a latent process and the responsibility of its actualization belongs to the province of conscious striving. As Jung says, "... the integration of the personality waits upon a challenge which willingly or unwillingly we offer to ourselves. It is a problem that appears to haunt a great many of us, for *the process of individuation is far from an automatic psychic development*."<sup>28</sup> It is when the challenge is received unwillingly and remains so through lack of moral decision that the trouble begins. If the individual identifies with his narrow, conscious "persona", if he does not actively co-operate in raising the unconscious level to a conscious assimilation, he is then "seized" by the autonomous archetypal complexes. In this possessed state psychic abnormalities develop which leave the consciousness at the control and mercy of the now demonic unconscious.

Now, of course, the question is, "How does the Transcendent Function unfold in the process of Individuation?" As Progoff says, "It is a process that is exceedingly difficult to define, not only because it contains certain inherent obscurities as a psychological conception, but because if we could define 'individuation' with precision, we would at the same time be defining the ultimate meaning of human life."<sup>29</sup> And also, one is faced with the practical task of

<sup>28</sup> Jung, *the Integration of the Personality*, p. 32.

<sup>29</sup> Progoff, *DRP*, p. 180.

systematizing the thought of Jung, a task which he seems to have left to lesser minds. Throughout his writings, he uses the archetypes in mixed categories. Sometimes they are used as basic processes, sometimes as distinguishable functions, sometimes as generic symbols, and finally, they are sometimes inter-mixed as sub-functions of each other. There is a desperate need in Jung's work for a consistently structured typology of archetypal categories.

Most interpretations of Jung, in simplifying the analysis of the Individuation process in order to describe and explain it functionally, structure their explanation in an ascending order of developmental levels. One is at first suspicious of this method because of the basic truth that many processes in the psyche are active concurrently. However, one must at least distinguish the concepts as a matter of logical necessity. Furthermore, Jung himself conceives of the Individuation process in developmental terms. In speaking of the potential directedness of the unconscious he says, "When the conscious mind participates actively and experiences each stage of the process, or at least understands it intuitively, then the next image always starts off on the higher level that has been won, and purposiveness develops."<sup>30</sup> Also, his statement about the "passionate yearnings of the highly-developed mind" would seem to indicate an ascending order of archetypal manifestation and assimilation. The order in which I would structure the Individuation process would involve the ascending stages of Persona, Shadow, Anima, Self, and possibly, Mana-personality and God (no other writer, to the best of my knowledge, has proposed this particular developmental sequence).

The Persona is the first level to transcend because it involves the recognition of depths to the psyche beyond the selective, narrow, and most often superficial, level of life. The Persona involves the over-development of our conscious superior function; a mistake which triggers the complexes of the unconscious. "The Persona is a complicated system of relations between individual consciousness and society . . . a kind of mask, designed on the one hand to make a definite impression upon others, and, on the other, to conceal the true nature of the individual."<sup>31</sup> This construction of an artificial personality becomes an unavoidable necessity because of the demands of society for the surety of definitive social roles. But it is necessary and possible to cultivate a properly developed Persona so as to widen its exclusive character and to prevent the repression of any one of the functions of feeling, thinking, intuition, or sensation. If any function of our personality is denied expression, the one-sided Persona becomes dangerous and harmful to the individual's development. "The dissolution of the (restrictive) Persona is therefore absolutely necessary for individuation."<sup>32</sup>

The second step is the assimilation of the contents of the Shadow into the conscious level. This Shadow represents the con-

<sup>30</sup> Jung, *TEAP*, p. 244.    <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 203.    <sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 297. Underline mine.

tents of the inferior function, and it is the "dangerous aspect of the unrecognized dark half of the personality."<sup>33</sup> The symbol of the devil is a variant of this archetype. The unpleasant and negative character of the Shadow is, like all unconscious contents, projected by the individual onto objects and persons external to him. Facing up to this archetype involves withdrawing our unjust projections, and it "leads to the modesty we need in order to acknowledge imperfection."<sup>34</sup> Thus we can say that this archetype demands the assimilation of the irrational side of our personality.

The *anima* is the feminine archetype in man which produces moods, while its corresponding image in the female which produces opinions, is designated as the *animus*. As Jung asserts, "If the coming to terms with the shadow is the companion-piece to the individual's development, then that with the *anima* is the masterpiece. For the relation with the *anima* is again a test of courage and—more than that—a test by fire of all man's spiritual and moral forces."<sup>35</sup> Jolan Jacobi, in his *The Psychology of Jung*, sums up the contribution of the *anima* thusly: "As the making conscious of the shadow makes possible the knowledge of our other dark aspects, so does the making conscious of the soul-image (*anima*) enable us to gain knowledge of the contrasexual in our own psyche. When this image is recognized and revealed, then it ceases to work from out of the unconscious and allows us finally to differentiate this contrasexual component and to incorporate it into our conscious orientation, through which an extraordinary enrichment of the contents belonging to our consciousness and therewith a broadening of our personality is attained."<sup>36</sup> We can say, therefore, that through the *anima* archetype the individual becomes capable of embodying the virtues of empathy, compassion, and a deeper understanding of life through the acceptance of the non-rational elements of existence.

And now we come to the archetype of the Self which is both the driving symbol of the Individuation process and the psychoid reality which undergoes the development. As a symbol, the Self is commonly manifested as a divine child or a saviour, and it appears universally in the wholeness symbol of the symmetrical mandala. "As a rule, the phenomenon (of the mandala experience) is spontaneous, coming and going on its own initiative. Its effect is astonishing in that it almost always brings about a solution of psychic complications, and thereby frees the inner personality from emotional and imaginary entanglements, creating thus a unity of being, which is universally felt as a release."<sup>37</sup> "Thus the mandala has the dignity of a 'reconciling' symbol."<sup>38</sup> So it is that the archetypal symbol has a unifying force, raising the psyche to a new level of development. And on the level of the Self the symbol has a saving power, opening

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106.

<sup>34</sup> Jung, *US*, p. 104.

<sup>35</sup> Jung, *IP*, pp. 78–9.

<sup>36</sup> Jolan Jacobi, *The Psychology of Jung*, pp. 113–4.

<sup>37</sup> Wilhelm and Jung, *op. cit.*, pp. 104–5.

<sup>38</sup> Jung, *PR*, p. 96.



up the individual to an experience of wholeness akin to rebirth on a transcendental plane.

Beside the balanced design of the mandala, another historically frequent symbol of the Self is the Divine Child or the Saviour-messiah figure. Jung refers to Christ, for instance, as a symbol of the Self—and, speaking phenomenologically, he refuses to draw explicit ontological conclusions on the basis of this statement. Progoff explains Jung's meaning here as, "the validity of the Christ symbol grows out of the primary reality of the Self and that, from a psychological point of view, the authenticity of the Christ symbol derives from the fact that it expresses the Self in symbolic form. What the Western man experiences as real when he participates in the symbol of Christ is only proximately Christ and ultimately is the Self, which is a universal reality for man transcending the historical variations of the form in which it appears."<sup>39</sup>

Yet, although Progoff says that the Self archetype is both the beginning and the end of man's development, and although Jung designates the term "self" as the totality of man, it seems that there are two more archetypal complexes whose influence is necessary to complete and establish the Self level. The first of these is the compensatory function, the *Mana*-personality, which is a dangerous threat to the attainment of the Self because it can assume possession of the person who naively falls into its power. God-like symbols of the Hero, the Old Wise Man and *Magna Mater*, are manifestations of this archetype which inflates and then tyrannizes the Self which has identified with it. As Jung says, "This development is an almost regular phenomenon. I have never yet seen a fairly advanced development of this kind where at least a temporary identification with the archetype of the *Mana*-personality did not take place. It is the most natural thing in the world that this should happen, for not only does one expect it oneself, but everybody else expects it too. One can scarcely help admiring oneself a little for having seen more deeply into things than others, and the others have such an urge to find a tangible hero somewhere, or a superior wise man, a leader and a father, some undisputed authority, that they build temples to little tin gods with the greatest promptitude and burn incense upon the altars."<sup>40</sup> What this essentially means is that conscious assimilation of the *Mana*-personality archetype is a prerequisite for a proper attitude of humility and responsibility on the part of the superior Self. The fatal mistake of identifying with it results in the tragic and dangerous appearance of a bloated Führer to whom the multitude of immature are inexorably and fatefully drawn. And there is yet another fatal error to be avoided. "It is now quite possible that, instead of identifying with the *mana*-personality, one will concretize it as an extra-mundane "Father in Heaven", complete with the attribute of absoluteness—something that many people seem prone to do. This would be tantamount to giving the unconscious the

<sup>39</sup> Progoff, *DRP*, p. 183.

<sup>40</sup> Jung, *TEAP*, pp. 245-6.

preponderance that was just as absolute (if one's faith could be pushed that far!), so that all value would flow over to that side. The logical result is that the only thing left behind here is a miserable, inferior, worthless, and sinful humanity. This solution, as we know, has become an historical world view."<sup>41</sup> That the faith of Western man has been pushed this far is a fact only too well attested by Freudian analysis—which had uncovered so much of this projected divinity phenomenon that it made the mistake of assuming it to be the universal norm of religious experience.

It is thus imperative for the Self to avoid the twin fallacies and traps of the *Mana*-personality. Jung is not too optimistic about the chances of successfully escaping this trap. He believes that, "One can only alter one's attitude and thus save oneself from naively falling into an archetype and being forced to act a part at the expense of one's humanity."<sup>42</sup> Yet this resigned solution cannot be so simple as altering an attitude, and actually Jung himself offers a more profound and dynamic solution (even though it is implicit). And this solution is also provided for by the unconscious in the form of the God archetype which is distinct from the false gods of the *Mana*-personality. It is the God archetype which provides us with the creative ground of the Self instead of leaving us suspended on the narrow area of an "altered" attitudinal construction. The God archetype serves as a "trans-personal control point", and it gives expression to the unique and *meaningful* way in which the workings of the autonomous complexes are experienced and tied together. "Therefore, by affixing the attribute 'divine' to the workings of the autonomous contents, we are admitting their relatively superior force. And it is this superior force which has at all times constrained men to ponder the inconceivable, and even to impose the greatest suffering upon themselves in order to give these workings their due. It is a force as real as hunger and the fear of death."<sup>43</sup> Furthermore, the Self is found to have a cosmological setting because of the inherent "mystical" idea of the archetype that God is within man. The quaternity symbol, as the manifestation of the God archetype, is a "more or less direct representation of the God manifested in his creation."<sup>44</sup> It is thus that we can see that the Self is not completely realized until it has developed through the mandala stage in which humanity replaces deity, to the quaternity level on which humanity and deity are both aspects of one reality.

And now, with this exposition of Jung's theory as the background, we are in a position to extract its metaphysic or ontology of human evil. On the basis of this analytical conceptual framework there are two fundamental propositions which unfold: 1. The Transpersonal Unconscious, as the residue of ancestral experience, contains both Good and Evil forces which dynamically influence the psyche of the individual in spite of his conscious motives and rational goals. This Transpersonal power forms a "given" in our

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 247-8.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 246.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 251-2.

<sup>44</sup> Jung, *PR.*, p. 72.

human nature, and, with respect to the evil aspect, we are always "potential criminals". In Jung's judgement, "None of us stands outside humanity's black collective shadow. Whether the crime lies many generations back or happens today, it remains the symptom of a disposition that is always and everywhere present—and one would therefore do well to possess some 'imagination in evil', for only the fool can permanently neglect the conditions of his own nature."<sup>45</sup>

2. The process of compensation of opposites causes the individual to be possessed by autonomous complexes which become an influence for evil unless the person *constantly* strives for self-realization through assimilation of the unconscious contents. These two principles considered together, posit Evil as a force with ontological status. Even those sins that are committed unconsciously are punished by the inexorable and uniform laws of the psyche, a psyche which does not permit compromise of virtue without disastrous effects on the development of the person. The process of Individuation, however, is exceedingly difficult; it is attained only by the few, and even for those few it is a trial by fire. What makes the situation even more complex is the fact that, while assimilation of the unconscious creates a higher level of morality, "in the last resort it is man's moral qualities which force him, either through direct recognition of the necessity to do so, or indirectly through a painful neurosis, to assimilate his unconscious self and to keep himself fully conscious."<sup>46</sup> Therefore unless we suffer the painful neurosis, we are confronted with the problem of gaining moral strength to confront the Individuation process. And at this point Jung almost falls into a doctrine of fatalism, for this necessary morality "seems to be a gift like intelligence. You cannot pump it into a system where it is not indigenous, though you may spoil it."<sup>47</sup> Most of us, however, are destined to travel the path of the neurosis. But through this trial we can take heart, because the unconscious "gives us all the encouragement and help that a bountiful nature can shower upon man"<sup>48</sup>—*if* we co-operate in the development of the Transcendent Function.

One of the best discussions of Jung's insights into the problem of Evil is to be found in Hostie's penetrating work.\*\* Hostie explains that for Jung psychic evil (psychic meaning the whole of reality as related to the self), "is to be defined as anything that hinders, prevents, falsifies, or distorts individuation."<sup>49</sup> He also shows that, "The psychic evil that Jung means is both positive and relative—relative insofar as it is created in each case by the reaction of the person whom it affects; positive (i.e., real) insofar as it is successful in its struggle against the tendency to full development."<sup>50</sup> Hostie's first major interpretive point is the assertion that there is ultimately

<sup>45</sup> Jung, *US*, pp. 96–7.

<sup>47</sup> Jung, *PR*, p. 93.

<sup>49</sup> Hostie, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

<sup>46</sup> Jung, *TEAP*, pp. 145–6. Cf. also pp. 300–1.

<sup>48</sup> Jung, *TEAP*, p. 126.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 190.



no hindrance to the tendency to full development of the self. He justifies this inference on the basis of his observation that when Jung "comes up against a situation that seems insoluble he always goes on in the serene conviction that the solution will eventually appear of its own accord if he has the courage to be patient . . . as soon as we face up to the adversary and look him straight in the eye he gives in. . . . Good itself results from this courageous facing up to evil."<sup>51</sup> Hostie then concludes, "Quite clearly then, in Jung's view, evil, which is a debilitating psychic force, does not originate from any ontological duality, for it is relative in its origin and ends by leading to a greater good. Evil comes from a false or unsatisfactory attitude, and disappears as soon as this is corrected. In all human development evil is the way to good."<sup>52</sup> Underlying this analysis by Hostie is his fundamental premise that we must interpret Jung's system *either* as a modern form of Manicheism, *or* as a psychological vindication and confirmation of the *malum est privatio boni* principle; this latter being the accepted doctrine of evil in Roman Catholic theology. It is in the *privatio boni* tradition that Hostie would place Jung. This conclusion, however, cannot be justified. The basic error of Hostie is his gross over-simplification of the dynamics of the Individuation process. While it may be said that every individual possesses the inherent tendency toward self-realization, the psychological evidence indicates that the seriousness of the "debilitating psychic force" is overwhelmingly preponderant in human life. As Jung so pointedly says, if the urge towards self-realization "were a matter of some teleological plan, then all individuals who enjoy a surplus of unconsciousness would necessarily be driven towards higher consciousness by an irresistible urge. That is plainly not the case. There are vast masses of the population who, despite their notorious unconsciousness, never get anywhere near a neurosis. The few who really are smitten by such a fate are persons of the 'higher' type who, for one reason or another, have remained too long on a primitive level."<sup>53</sup>

And as for Hostie's repudiation of the charge that Jung "supports a dualistic point of view that in its own way is a sort of revival of Manicheism",<sup>54</sup> it may very well be that this charge is not as false as he thinks. For Jung tells us, "If one can no longer avoid the realization that evil, without man's ever having chosen it, is lodged in human nature itself, then it bestrides the psychological stage as the equal and opposite partner of good. This realization leads straight to a psychological dualism. . . . The dualism does not come from this realization; rather, we are in a split condition to begin with."<sup>55</sup>

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 191.

<sup>53</sup> Jung, *TEAP*, p. 194. Compare A. H. Maslow's statement, "In general, we should learn to see as psychopathology any failure to achieve self-actualization. The average or normal person is just as much a case as the psychotic, even though less dramatic and less urgent." *Motivation and Personality*, p. 370.

<sup>54</sup> Hostie, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

<sup>55</sup> Jung, *US*, p. 98.

One possible theological integration of Jungian psychological insights is the following. In man, the 'Given' non-rational content of his psychic structure produces inevitable or inherent non-moral Evil (original sin) which is experienced as irrational when it erupts as sin. Thus, Jung speaks wisely when he says that the concept of original sin is almost a euphemism. The case is far graver and grossly underestimated! Actual sin is relatively less serious since it is an evil due to a moral choice which man consciously wills, whereas the inherent non-moral Evil of man's nature is more profound and has cosmological and ontological repercussions when man fails to assume control of it. The sins of omission are *at least* as damaging to human development as are the sins of commission. When man severs the bond of mutual relationship with God—whose Providence is the ground of the Archetypes, and whose Grace is the power of the Transcendent Function—then he falls victim to the disease of cancerous guilt and neurotic anxiety. But, when he opens himself to the saving power of the sacramental symbols of historic religion, and reacts against his demonic projections through active love of his fellowman, he then achieves the higher ontological level of the actualized Self. Man will continue to sin and dehumanize himself. Yet we may justifiably expect that the horrifying dimensions of man's innate sinfulness will diminish as he co-creates with God, developing and widening his conscious capacities, and, through history accumulating in the universal Transpersonal Unconscious a preponderant deposit of 'original' virtue.

#### *Postscript*

Since the completion of this paper, I have read H. L. Philp's *Jung and the Problem of Evil* (Rockliff pub., London, 1958). This well-documented work should certainly be included in a study of this topic. I do not find, however, that Philp's defence of the *privatio boni* concept and his criticism of Jung would require me to revise radically the direction of my interpretation of Jung. On the contrary, Jung explicitly rejects Hostie's interpretation of him in letters to Philp which Philp cites.

**Ronald M. Mazur** is in his first ministry at the First Parish Church, Unitarian, of Stow, Mass. He is an A.B. in Psychology and Philosophy (Boston, University, 1955) and graduated with S.T.B. from Harvard Divinity School in 1959.

## *Editorial Postscript*

THERE has been a notable spurt of theological interest in English Unitarian circles through the publication by the Lindsey Press last October of a Symposium of *Essays in Unitarian Theology* (140 pp., 8/6d.), edited by Kenneth Twinn, and more recently the Essex Hall Lecture, *Towards a New Theology* (27 pp., 2/-), by S. P. Whitehouse. Both of these are thoughtful and stimulating.



It is with the significance of these works against the background of their noted predecessor, *A Free Religious Faith: the Report of a Unitarian Commission* (219 pp., 5/-), published 15 years ago, that I am concerned. Nothing of like theological interest has come from the Lindsey Press in the intervening years, with the possible exception of A. P. Hewett's *An Unfettered Faith* (8/6d.).

The earlier work, with the exception of a few notes and appendices, was presented as an agreed statement by the whole Commission, although the chapters were written by individuals and accepted by the group often without so much as a comma altered. The recent Symposium, on the other hand, makes no attempt to present an agreed view. The chapters carry their author's names and express individual points of view, and with varying emphasis.

The 1935 Report succeeded in expressing a modern faith which the great majority of us could accept. Moreover it showed how far we had moved to a position basically independent of Orthodox Christian Theology. It also showed, by adopting a free but scientific attitude towards both the inner and outer aspects of reality, that such a free and progressive theology could be built and maintained. By comparison, the recent Symposium is fragmentary and is made up of individual reactions to certain high-lighted aspects of the contemporary world of scholarship and experience. One discerning critic at a ministers' fraternal found an underlying unity between the writers in that every one of them seemed to be aware of the prevailing atmosphere of uneasiness, the sense of profound frustration and the yearning for an unrealized unity between God, the Universe and Man, or between Science, Technology and human needs. Is our only unity one of existential *angst*? Then, we had better do something about it!

But it is difficult to advance sound theological thought in times of stress. The necessary detachment is hard to achieve and one tends to fall back on the great religious myths. Nevertheless these essays give heartening evidence of a virile liberal reaction to contemporary schools of thought.

Because of their existential need the writers often speak in the convictional language of religion rather than in the objective language of a scientifically grounded theology. Although some of the writers explicitly recognize the difference between theology and religion they do not adhere to it. Those of us who preach are too prone to use emotionally-toned convictional language at times when we should be dispassionately factual and objectively critical.

When we consider S. P. Whitehouse's *Towards a New Theology* we find he does stick to his last and give pretty solid justification for his conclusion that the issue before man to-day is theism as against atheism. If it is to be theism, that theism must be grounded in science. But the theology of such a faith has still to be expounded.

In 1947, two years after the appearance of *A Free Religious Faith*, we took up in *Faith and Freedom* the task of working out the new theology implied in the Report, especially in such chapters as



that on "Self-Consciousness, Personality and God". The stage was set and the main problems were set forth in the first Editorial (No. 1, p. 2). It has to be admitted that only occasionally have we been able to publish anything which really advanced us towards a scientifically based theology.

Our conclusion remains essentially unchanged from 13 years ago:— 'A Theology which can encompass holistic evolution and interpret it as the progressive process of incarnation in which life seeks a divinity which forever transcends it, will have no fear that the human mind is near the end of its tether!

But Religion itself is not, of course, scientifically based. That is why the distinction between Religion and Theology should be clearly manifest in all we write.

### *"Spiritual No-Man's Land"*

Sir,

Mr. Peter Flinn's letter is a good example of the traditional Unitarian approach to religion, predominant in Unitarian worship. Mr. Flinn's approach to religion is based on a desire to establish the reality of a Personal God. My approach, on the other hand, rests on a desire to promote and sustain in man's heart the highest aspirations. I do not feel particularly concerned to go behind these aspirations and speculate on the nature of their source. Mr. Flinn no doubt does.

More shortly, Mr. Flinn's religion is theological, mine ethical. This difference of approach goes to the root of religious expression, particularly in public worship.

By contrast with Mr. Flinn, some extreme humanists feel concerned to establish the non-existence of a Personal God. This approach to religion is equally foreign to my own, which is why I described my religious viewpoint as being in a Spiritual No-Man's land.

To me, the truest and most sublime approach to religion is purely ethical. The existence or non-existence of a Personal God does not appear to me to be a relevant subject of enquiry in religion. The essence of religion, to me, is ethical values, not their source. My "God" is an inner urge within the human heart after the highest aspirations, not an external Person. The former is a reality to me, the latter an incomprehensibility.

"For not in far-off realms of space

The Spirit hath *its* throne;

In every heart *it* findeth place

And waiteth to be known."

Yours, etc.,

Swansea

OSWALD DEAKIN.